

favoring higher pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4015. Also, petition of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers of North America, favoring amnesty to political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4016. Also, petition of G. E. Barton, of New York, against bonus to uninjured soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4017. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Waiters' Union, Local 30, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4018. Also, petition of J. T. Bradley, of Grass Valley, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4019. Also, petition of Air Reduction Sales Co., of Emeryville, Calif., protesting against Senate bill 3223 and House bill 9932; to the Committee on Patents.

4020. By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Community Association of Charlotte, Mich., favoring increased rates on the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4021. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Hon. J. P. Mahoney, mayor of Newport; David C. Caesar, president Newport Chamber of Commerce; H. F. Busby, secretary local No. 268, I. B. E. W., Newport; John McGrane, molders' union, Newport; O. Shea, secretary laborers' local No. 407, Newport; Oliver W. Barker, secretary local No. 15553, Newport; William P. Noonan, Newport Boilermakers' Union; James Percy, National Association of Supervisors, Narragansett Bay district; Joseph Trigueiro, secretary Machinists' Lodge No. 119, Newport; James E. Devine, local No. 703, plumbers and steamfitters, Newport; C. A. McManus, recording secretary local No. 175, sheet-metal workers and coppersmiths union, Newport; Perry B. Dawley, secretary Carpenters' District Council, Newport, all in the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the proposed elimination or reduction of the item of \$200,000 for maintenance of the naval torpedo station at Newport, R. I., as contained in the naval appropriation bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

4022. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of John N. Cole, of Boston, Mass., favoring additional Federal aid for good roads; to the Committee on Roads.

4023. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., in regard to higher pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4024. By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Parkersburg Soldiers' Aid, of Parkersburg, W. Va., favoring enactment of law for observance, on May 30 of each year, of the services of the soldiers and sailors of the recent war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

Monday, May 31, 1920.

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1920.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Fernald	McCumber	Sheppard
Beckham	France	McKellar	Shields
Borah	Gay	McLean	Simmons
Brandegee	Gerry	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Capper	Harding	New	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Harris	Norris	Smoot
Colt	Harrison	Nugent	Spencer
Comer	Henderson	Page	Sutherland
Culberson	Hitchcock	Phipps	Thomas
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Poindexter	Underwood
Dillingham	Keyes	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Edge	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Elkins	Lodge	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Fall	McCormick	Robinson	Warren

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 4411. An act granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Pembina, N. Dak., and Kittson, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North at or near the city of Pembina, N. Dak.; and

S. 4431. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rock River, in Lee County, State of Illinois, at or near the city of Dixon, in said county.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 336) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the Albert Sidney Johnston Camp, United Confederate Veterans, No. 1820, Fort Worth, Tex., 100 cots and blankets for the use of Confederate veterans at the reunion of said camp June 24 to 27, inclusive, 1920.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9783) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 14157) to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War; to provide revenue therefor; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of Perry L. Haynes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the bill, agrees to the further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, Mr. DEMPSEY, and Mr. GALLAGHER managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 12272. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and

H. R. 12775. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a certified copy of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada, which relates to the establishment of the Tahoe National Park, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint resolution relative to the establishment of the Tahoe National Park.

Whereas Lake Tahoe and the basin surrounding it constitute one of the scenic wonders of the world, and should be preserved for all time for the people; and

Whereas private ownership of said section has despoiled a large part of the surrounding basin and is a bar to development of the natural beauty and resources of that section; and

Whereas similar natural wonders in other sections of the country are under the control of the Federal Government, and receive better care and attention than is possible under private ownership: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada (the Assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to include Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Basin in a national park under the control of the United States, and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Interior and to our Senators and Representative in Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the president of the senate and speaker of the assembly of the State of California, and that the Legislature of the State of

California be requested to join with the State of Nevada in petitioning the Congress for the establishment of a national park as herein stated.

MAURICE J. SULLIVAN,
President of the Senate.
R. A. MCKAY,
Secretary of the Senate.
D. J. FITZGERALD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
J. H. CAUSTEN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Approved March 26, 1919.

EMMET D. BOYLE, *Governor.*

I certify the within and foregoing to be a true copy of the original enrolled resolution on file and of record in my office, and further that said resolution was duly passed and adopted on March 18, 1919, and was approved by the Governor on March 26, 1919, and deposited in my office.

[SEAL.]

GEORGE BRODIGAN,
Secretary of State.

By R. P. BURRIS, *Deputy.*

Mr. LODGE. I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring increased compensation for employees of the Postal Service. I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, 1920.

An order relative to the compensation of United States postal employees:

Whereas the Post Office employees of the United States represent that their wages have not been increased in proportion to the increased cost of living; and

Whereas if many such employees leave the service of the United States, as they have signified their intention so to do, there will be a resultant decrease in the efficiency of the Postal Service with an attendant interruption of and interference with business and industrial operation: Therefore be it

Ordered, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives records itself in favor of such action by Congress as may be necessary to maintain the present efficiency of the Postal Service; and be it further

Ordered, That copies of this order be transmitted by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to the Members in Congress from Massachusetts.

In the house of representatives, adopted May 19, 1920.

A true copy.

Attest:

ALBERT I. LANGLEY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Platt County, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the practice of chiropractic in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 4432) to provide for awarding decorations, devices, or insignia to the next of kin of deceased persons who would have been entitled to receive the same, and making it unlawful for anyone other than the person authorized to do so to wear such decoration, device, or insignia, reported it without amendment.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2665) for the relief of Prof. William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, to establish Hart University, and to provide for its maintenance and support, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 646) thereon.

WILLIAM H. H. HART.

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims, reported the following resolution (S. Res. 377):

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2665) entitled "A bill for the relief of William H. H. Hart, principal of the Hart Farm School and Junior Republic for Dependent Children, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act

entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 4472) to authorize loans on silver bullion, to regulate interstate shipments of ore containing silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4473) to revise and equalize rates of pension to the survivors of certain Indian wars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 4474) granting an increase of pension to Delia Chagnon (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 14157. An act to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of the World War, to provide revenue therefor, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ARMENIAN MANDATORY.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 27, respectfully declining to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like now to have a formal understanding reached. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether we can not come to an agreement as to a time to vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know if the Senator from Massachusetts has any suggestion as to a time for a vote.

Mr. LODGE. So that we may have an agreement to vote I have no suggestion to make. I leave it to the Senator to make a suggestion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would Wednesday at some hour be satisfactory?

Mr. LODGE. Wednesday would suit me, and, as far as I can speak for any others, I think it would suit.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As far as I know, there is no objection to coming to a vote, and if some hour on Wednesday afternoon would suit the Senator I am willing to agree to it.

Mr. NORRIS. May I suggest that if we are to adjourn this week, it seems to me it is going to be necessary to devote less time to this measure. Unless Senators are anxious to take up the time, could we not reach a vote to-morrow? Would that shut out anyone who desires to be heard?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is my judgment that the difficulty will be not that there will be many speeches on the subject, but there is some difficulty with Senators in making up their minds exactly as to what they want to do. I think between now and Wednesday much other business can be transacted; I only suggested Wednesday because—

Mr. NORRIS. If we had it tacitly understood that when Senators were not ready to debate the resolution, it should be temporarily laid aside, so that we could transact other business, I would not have any objection. There is a good deal of other business that ought to be transacted before we take a recess.

Mr. LODGE. Unless Senators desire to debate it, of course we can take up other business by unanimous consent very easily. If we agree to take the vote on Wednesday, that will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I may be allowed to make a suggestion to the Senator from Nebraska, in a colloquy that the Senator and I had on Saturday the Senator stated that he would to-day ask for a unanimous-consent agreement, as I understood him, to vote some time to-morrow, Tuesday. When the matter was first brought before the Senate it was stated by the Senator that he did not anticipate much debate on the question, and he announced that he was himself opposed to the acceptance of the mandate. Still he said he desired some time to prepare a proposed amendment; and it was for that reason, and also for the reason, as the Senator stated, that some of the Senators had left the Chamber and he had not had an opportunity to consult with them Saturday afternoon, that the matter went over until to-day. The mere fixing of a time to vote would not necessarily imply that we have got to devote all the time between now and the time fixed for a vote in the discussion of this question, because when no one cares to discuss this question it will be tem-

porarily laid aside and other business transacted. But inasmuch as the matter has to go to the House of Representatives, the President's communication being addressed to Congress and this being a concurrent resolution in reply, it seems to me that unless some Senator states that he wants time to debate it to a greater extent than could be afforded by voting on it to-morrow, we might agree to vote to-morrow. I am influenced in this not at all by a desire to curtail any Senator but simply by the obvious fact suggested by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], that we have only four more days after to-day before the Republicans, at least many of them, must leave for their national convention, and the calendar is crowded with work. I think the President ought to have an answer to this categorical inquiry, which is very important to us and to Europe and Asia, before we adjourn for six months, and we should not leave the thing all afloat. I submit those considerations to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is very little difference in the ultimate result, whether we vote to-morrow or on Wednesday. Personally, to me there is no objection to voting on to-morrow. The Senator from Massachusetts asked me to suggest a date, and I suggested 4 o'clock Wednesday. I would not object to any hour to-morrow, but I can not answer for others. There are some speeches to be made.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I would be glad to have a vote to-morrow and get the resolution out of the way. The House ought to act upon it. I have no idea what their intentions are. If they propose to act on it they have the machinery which enables them to act on very short notice, and they would have plenty of time. I would be very glad if the Senator would assent to making it 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Not later than 4 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Not later than 4 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to point out to him the fact that at half after 4 o'clock to-morrow the Senate will proceed under an order heretofore entered to hear eulogies in memory of a former Member of Congress, Gen. ESTOPINAL, of Louisiana? I do not know what length of time will be consumed in those ceremonies. So I suggest—

Mr. LODGE. We might postpone the eulogies for a few moments. I do not think that would be too late.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I suggest, if we agree on some hour to-morrow afternoon, that we meet earlier in the morning, in view of the announcement made by the Senator from Arkansas, and dispose of the pending resolution before the hour set for the memorial addresses.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to meet at any early hour. We can make it not later than 4 o'clock perfectly well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon Senate concurrent resolution 27, a resolution respectfully declining to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia, as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts at what hour he expects to-morrow to take up the Armenian question?

Mr. LODGE. The whole time is given to it from now until to-morrow when the vote is to be taken.

Mr. KING. I have no objection to the proposed agreement.

Mr. REED. There is a question as to whether we are going to adjourn or recess.

Mr. LODGE. On Saturday?

Mr. REED. No; the question is whether we shall adjourn or take a recess this evening.

Mr. LODGE. A recess. I intend to keep the concurrent resolution before the Senate unless a time arrives when no one desires to speak upon it, and then of course we could lay it aside for other business. It is understood that it is to be kept steadily before the Senate until 4 o'clock to-morrow, and that we shall take a recess this afternoon.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. Since the Senator from Missouri has raised the question of a recess, I should like to ask if before the ultimate adjournment or recess the Committee on the Judiciary purposes to report a joint resolution repealing wholly or in part the so-called war acts? If we are going to give two days to the discussion of the Armenian resolution, I wonder what time we may have to consider the repeal of those acts, which

no longer inure to the benefit of the country and very obviously inure in some degree to its great disadvantage.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I hope the bill to which the Senator refers will soon be brought before the Senate, but we can not make a unanimous-consent agreement as to two measures; we have got to make a unanimous-consent agreement as to one bill as a preliminary. I think the matter which is now before us ought to be disposed of at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to entering into the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the agreement is made, I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Massachusetts that he incorporate in the agreement the stipulation that the Senate shall meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning, and that no speeches made on to-morrow shall exceed one hour in length if any other Senator desires to speak.

Mr. LODGE. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept that suggestion.

Mr. REED. I will say not to exceed 45 minutes if any other Senator desires to speak.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I suggest that we make it absolute. We can not tell whether or not any other Senator desires to speak until the time arrives.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Four or five Senators always desire to speak.

Mr. REED. I am willing to make the time limitation 45 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to accept that addition, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous-consent agreement asked for by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon Senate concurrent resolution 27, a resolution proposing that Congress respectfully declines to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia, as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920; that upon the said calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock a. m.; and, further, that on said calendar day no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 45 minutes upon the said resolution and any amendment or amendments offered thereto.

Mr. REED. I wish to change the phraseology of the unanimous-consent agreement. The statement contained therein is "No Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 45 minutes." I think that ought to be changed so as to read: "Shall speak in all more than 45 minutes." That will give any Senator making a proposal an opportunity to advocate it and, possibly, to reply to criticisms which may be made of it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to ask has the Senator from Nebraska yet submitted his proposed amendment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not yet offered the amendment; I shall ask to have it printed to-day. I desire to make some revision of it.

Mr. President, in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement I should like to have incorporated at the appropriate place, if the Senator from Massachusetts will permit, the words "and a motion to recommit shall be considered as a disposition."

Mr. LODGE. That would be in order and could not be cut out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I had some doubt as to whether, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that would be a disposition of the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. A motion to recommit would be in order, and if agreed to would be a disposition of the resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If that is understood, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am just as anxious to vote on this resolution as is any other Senator, I suppose, but I do not know the nature of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, and I dislike to agree to a proposal for unanimous consent for a final vote until I am informed as to that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska has been printed in the Record.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to ask that the amendment may be read.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The amendment is in the Record, having been read on Saturday. However, I will read it again. It is as follows:

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, empowered to appoint three American citizens to act with a like number of representatives of the Government of Armenia in the organization of a joint commission, the six so chosen to select a seventh person as chairman. Said joint commission shall be charged with the duty of supervising the preparation, issuance, offering for sale, and sale in the United States of bonds of the Armenian Government, not exceeding \$50,000,000 in amount, the proceeds of which shall be available under

approval of the commission for the following purposes, to wit: To purchase in the United States agricultural implements, materials for railroad development, construction, and repair in Armenia, and other similar supplies for economic development and rehabilitation that may be designated by the Armenian Government: *Provided*, That not to exceed one-half of this amount may be used for the purpose of rehabilitating and establishing a sound banking and currency system for Armenia in case the Armenian Government may so decide under the advice and approval of this joint commission.

These bonds may be made payable in the United States, but the Government of the United States is not to be made in any sense responsible for the payment of either principal or interest.

Mr. BORAH. Are the commission and the acts which it shall perform to have any sanction on the part of our Government? Is the commission to have the Government sanction behind it? That is to say, is the Government to become responsible in any way for its actions?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Government does not become responsible, as is stated in the proposed amendment, for either the principal or the interest of the bonds, but it is intended that the bonds shall be issued under such official supervision as will guarantee to the American people who subscribe to them that the money derived from their sale shall be used for the purposes designated.

Mr. BORAH. In case, however, the bonds, after they are once subscribed for and taken by the American people, should not be paid, would the Government of the United States be under either a legal or moral responsibility to take care of them?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Oh, no; I think not. It is simply a guaranty, so far as can be made, that the money which the friends of Armenia subscribe for the bonds shall be expended for useful purposes and for rehabilitating Armenia, and will not be turned over to the disposition of people far away from the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

The unanimous-consent agreement as entered into is as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon Senate concurrent resolution 27, a resolution proposing that Congress respectfully declines to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia, as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920; that upon the said calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock a. m.; and, further, that on the said calendar day no Senator shall speak in all more than 45 minutes upon the said resolution and any amendment or amendments offered thereto.

NOMINATION OF W. L. FRIERSON.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, one day last week the nomination of Hon. W. L. Frierson to be Solicitor General was sent to the Senate. That office is vacant, Judge Alexander C. King having been appointed and confirmed circuit judge of the fifth circuit. Mr. Frierson is now acting as Assistant Attorney General. His nomination has not been referred to the committee. It is one that ought to be acted upon, and I ask that, as in open executive session, the nomination be now referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That order will be made unless the nomination has already been referred. The Chair has a recollection that it is in the hands of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SHIELDS. It had not been sent to the Judiciary Committee up to this morning, and for that reason I make the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AFFAIRS IN MEXICO (S. DOC. NO. 285).

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] may be permitted at this time to submit a report which he has been authorized to present by the Foreign Relations Committee. It will not lead to any debate, of course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FALL. From the Committee on Foreign Relations I present the report (No. 645) of the committee appointed under Senate resolution 106 for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon certain facts, matters, and suggestions with reference to Mexican affairs as affecting American citizens and American property rights.

In connection with the report it should be stated that it is accompanied by a number of documents, some of which are not entirely ready, but will be ready within the next day or two. I should like to have the report now accepted, with the accompanying documents, and ordered printed.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he has requested that the report submitted by him with the accompanying evidence, which will follow later on, be made a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule is that the request of a Senator is granted unless there is objection. The Chair does not always announce that there is no objection.

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to be sure that the request contemplated making the report and the accompanying papers a Senate document.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts reminds me that I did not specifically request that the report and accompanying papers be made a Senate document. It is impossible to print it all in the RECORD, as it consists of over 5,000 pages. I simply desire that the report may, with the accompanying documents, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HUMBOLDT NATIONAL FOREST.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. President, if there is nothing now before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest. It is a local matter, and will create no discussion, I am sure.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to suggest to the Senator as a substitute for his request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII; that is, if there is no Senator ready to proceed with the discussion of the pending matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The effect of the request of the Senator from Montana is that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. What is the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the understanding was that we were to take up the Armenian question.

Mr. LODGE. It was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was nothing being taken up, and it was thought that the Senate should take up something.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not desire to interfere with the discussion on the Armenian question.

Mr. HENDERSON. As there appeared to be nothing before the Senate and I had a small bill which I thought I might get out of the way in a minute, I asked that it be considered. It will involve no discussion, being purely a local matter.

Mr. LODGE. It was clearly understood, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that if any Senator desired to speak upon the Armenian resolution, that would have precedence, and that we should not lay the unfinished business aside. Therefore I shall have to object if any Senator desires to speak on the Armenian question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I desire to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I understood that matter thoroughly, but it seemed that no Senator desired to be heard on the subject. I would not have made the suggestion if it had been apparent that any Senator desired to speak, and I now withdraw the request.

Mr. HENDERSON. I withdraw my request also; but I waited a few moments and nothing was said by any Senator.

Mr. REED. If the Senator from Nevada has a bill which will require no discussion, I will not object to his having it considered.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am quite sure it will require no discussion; it is merely a local bill affecting the State of Nevada.

Mr. REED. I shall not object to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill which the Senator from Nevada has asked may be considered?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2279) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the word "flow," to strike out "or the regulation and improvement of grazing thereon"; in line 6, after the word "may," to insert "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior"; and, in line 10, after the word "Townships," to strike out "36, 37, 38, and 39 north, ranges 53 and 54 east" and insert "24 and 25 north of ranges 56 and 57 east," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any lands within the following-described areas found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber, the protection of stream flow, may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, be included within and made a part of the Humboldt National Forest by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests: Townships 24 and 25 north of ranges 56 and 57 east, Mount Diablo Indian.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICES FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Following the request of the Senator from Nevada, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the bill (S. 4435) to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "with," to insert "such," and on page 2, line 1, after the word "therefor," to insert "as may be first approved by the Secretary of the Navy," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized, upon application from the foreign Governments concerned, and whenever in his discretion the public interests require, to detail officers of the United States naval service to assist the Governments of the Republics of South America in naval matters: *Provided*, That the officers so detailed be, and they are hereby, authorized to accept offices from the Government to which detailed with such compensation and emoluments therefor as may be first approved by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by such Governments, the pay and allowances of their rank in the United States naval service, and they shall be entitled to the same credit while so detailed for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the United States naval service.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJUSTMENT OF WAR CONTRACTS.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going to ask for the consideration of a bill on the calendar which I think will involve no discussion at all. It will take only a moment for its consideration.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 4259) to provide further for the relief of war minerals producers, and to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919. It is a bill to supply a deficiency in the war mineral relief act. That act authorized those who supplied certain equipment and materials to the Government during the war to present claims for losses to the Secretary of War, and authorized an appeal from his decision to the Court of Claims. The same provision as to presenting claims for losses on behalf of those who produced or prepared to produce minerals authorized the presentation of those claims to the Secretary of the Interior, but failed to provide jurisdiction in the Court of Claims to hear claimants who were dissatisfied with the decision of the Secretary of the Interior. This bill supplies that deficiency.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, is that the only change that the bill makes?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the only change.

Mr. NELSON. It simply allows them to go into the Court of Claims?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Mines and Mining with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, after the word "approved," to strike out "March" and insert "February"; in section 2, page 2, line 4, before the word "act," to strike out "such" and insert "said"; in the same line, after the word

"of," to strike out "March" and insert "February"; in line 8, after the word "after," to strike out "March" and insert "February"; in line 18, after the word "hereby," to strike out "given" and insert "vested with"; in line 19, before the word "such," to strike out "hear" and insert "determine"; in the same line, after the word "claims," to strike out "de novo" and insert "in accordance with the provisions of section 5"; in line 20, after the word "judgment," to strike out "in accordance with section 5"; in line 22, after the word "to," to strike out "the" and insert "any"; in the same line, after the word "claimant," to strike out "in adjustment, liquidation, or payment of such losses" and insert "on account of such losses under the terms of said section 5. From the final judgment of the Court of Claims in cases arising under this act an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court of the United States in the manner provided in sections 242 and 243 of the Judicial Code," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved February 2, 1919, is hereby amended by striking out the words "that the decision of said Secretary shall be conclusive and final, subject to the limitations hereinafter provided" and the semicolon following such words.

The fourth paragraph of such section is hereby amended by inserting after the words "That nothing in this section shall be construed to confer jurisdiction upon any court to entertain a suit against the United States," a comma, and the following words: "except as provided in section 6."

SEC. 2. That said act of February 2, 1919, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) That any claimant who has filed a claim under section 5 within three months after February 2, 1919, whose claim has been rejected, or who is not satisfied with the decision, adjustment, liquidation, or payment of net losses by the Secretary of the Interior under such section, may file a petition in the Court of Claims for the final determination of such losses. If before this section takes effect the Secretary has made a final decision of such claim, the petition must be filed within 90 days after this section takes effect; and in all other cases within 90 days after such final decision is made.

"(b) The Court of Claims is hereby vested with jurisdiction to determine such claims in accordance with the provisions of section 5 and to render judgment for such amount as it finds to be justly and equitably due to any claimant on account of such losses under the terms of said section 5. From the final judgment of the Court of Claims in cases arising under this act an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court of the United States in the manner provided in sections 242 and 243 of the Judicial Code.

"(c) Any payments made to the claimant under section 5 shall be certified by the Secretary of the Interior to the Court of Claims, and after judgment has been rendered by the court no further payments shall be made under section 5 unless in conformity with such judgment.

"(d) The receipt of any amount, or the giving of any acquittance or release, by the claimant under section 5 shall not be a bar to the remedy provided for by this section; but if any amount has been awarded and paid under section 5, the petition may not be considered until the petitioner executes a bond in an amount and with sureties satisfactory to the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, conditioned that if the court finds that a less amount is due than has been awarded by the Secretary of the Interior, the claimant will forthwith pay to the United States so much of the amount received under section 5 as is in excess of the amount found due by the court. Any amount thus paid to the United States shall be credited to the funds available for the paying of awards under section 5 and of judgments under this section.

"(e) Upon the filing of a petition in the Court of Claims under this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall forthwith certify to the court all the testimony taken in the case and all documentary evidence introduced or considered by the Secretary or any commission appointed by his authority, and such testimony and evidence shall be used and considered by the court upon the hearing and trial of the claim, and shall be given such weight as the court may determine.

"(f) Each judgment rendered by the Court of Claims under this section shall be certified by the chief clerk of the court to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the claimant the amount of such judgment, out of the revolving fund created by section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of those ores, metals, and minerals which have formerly been largely imported, or of which there is or may be an inadequate supply,' approved October 5, 1918, which fund shall remain available for such purpose until all such judgments have been paid: *Provided*, That when the amount of such judgments so paid, plus the payments made to claimants and the expenses of administration under section 5 of this act (after allowance for amounts repaid to the United States under subdivision (d) of this section), reach the sum of \$8,500,000 no further payments from such revolving fund shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury under this section, or by the Secretary of the Interior under section 5."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide further for the relief of war minerals producers, and to amend an act entitled 'An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes,' approved February 2, 1919."

TRANSFER OF WAR MATERIAL.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Missouri yield to me a minute?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I think the Senator is interested in this bill, and it will not take any time, I think. If it does, I will withdraw it.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 13329) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer certain surplus material, machinery, and equipment to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes. It is a bill in which I think every Senator on this floor is interested. It proposes to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to distribute the surplus machinery that is now rusting in the country among the road commissions of the different States for the purpose of road building. The bill has passed the House and has been reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate; and at this time, when the various road commissions are building roads and need this machinery, there is no reason why it should not be distributed among the States.

I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill and pass it, because, if it is going to be acted upon at all, it ought to be at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask the Senator not to press his request at this time.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator objects—

Mr. KING. Yes; I object.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course, I will not interfere with the Senator.

ARMENIAN MANDATORY.

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 27, respectfully declining to grant to the Executive the power to accept a mandate over Armenia, as requested in the message of the President dated May 24, 1920.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the usual form, and also printed in the RECORD, the amendment which I propose later on to offer to the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, empowered to appoint three American citizens, to act with a like number of representatives of the Government of Armenia, in the organization of a joint commission, the six so chosen to select a seventh person as chairman. Said joint commission shall be charged with the duty of supervising the preparation, issuance, offering for sale, and sale in the United States of bonds of the Armenian Government, not exceeding \$50,000,000 in amount, the proceeds of which shall be available, under approval of the commission, for the following purposes, to wit: To purchase in the United States agricultural implements, materials for railroad development, construction, and repair in Armenia, and other similar supplies for economic development and rehabilitation that may be designated by the Armenian Government; *Provided*, That not to exceed one-half of this amount may be used for the purpose of rehabilitating and establishing a sound banking and currency system for Armenia, in case the Armenian Government may so decide, under the advice and approval of this joint commission.

These bonds may be made payable in the United States, but the Government of the United States is not to be made in any sense responsible for the payment of either principal or interest.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is with considerable regret that I undertake to discuss the question before the Senate, because other duties have made it impossible for me to give to the question the intimate study it deserves. I shall be obliged, in what I hope will be a very brief address, to deal with the subject matter in a general way.

This is the first practical application of the principles enunciated in the League of Nations. If I were for the League of Nations, I would be for the Armenian mandate; because the Armenian mandate is only the assumption of a part of the obligations which we are asked to undertake if we join the League of Nations. The Armenian mandate obliges us to assume the responsibility for a small section of the earth's surface lying in Asia. Its effect will be to oblige us to send our armies and our navies there to maintain peace and to hold people in subjection by armed force and to defend the country against attacks from the outside. But the obligations referred to will be directed to a specific territory. On the other hand, the League of Nations covenant obliges us to send our armies and our navies to protect every member of the league from attack. We are, in fact, to become partner in a scheme to hold all the world in subjection by armed force.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, in Armenia we are not confined to cases of exterior aggression.

Mr. REED. I made the distinction.

Mr. LODGE. I did not notice whether the Senator did or not.

Mr. REED. I made the distinction in my remarks. Let me finish my sentence.

The pending proposition undoubtedly obliges us to defend Armenia from attacks from the outside. It also imposes upon us the responsibility of maintaining order within the boundaries of Armenia; but the League of Nations imposes upon us the obligation to defend all members of the league attacked from the outside. It also imposes upon us the obligation, jointly with the other members of the league, to maintain order within States, for it is specifically provided that "any controversy affecting the peace of the world" is justiciable by the league. Notwithstanding the indisputable fact just stated, the singular situation is now presented that those who have been willing to swallow the League of Nations in its entirety when presented as a paper proposition now gag when they are put to the practical test of immediately accepting a small bite of the whole. I say this because the understanding is that many of those who advocated the league will reject the mandate. The situation serves to illustrate the difference between theory and fact, between promises and performances, between beautiful theories spun from the cobwebs of fancy and the stern business of carrying them into practical execution.

If we are to undertake the guardianship of the world, we might as well begin this Decoration Day morning by assuming the guardianship of this part of the world. If we are to assume jurisdiction over all the savages of the forests, all the Bedouins of the deserts, all the Lazarone of Asia and of Europe, this is a propitious opportunity and time for a beginning, sir, for to-day we scatter flowers upon the graves of the gallant dead who yielded their lives in other wars. We might, therefore, well proceed on this Decoration Day morning to make the contract that will involve us in still greater wars and fill our cemeteries with fresh corpses.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator has asserted, and his argument proceeds upon the assumption, that if the United States assumed a mandate over Armenia it would be obliged not only to take care of internal dissensions and uprisings but also to protect that country against external aggression. That idea is one that is very prevalent—that a part of the duty of the United States would be to protect Armenia in a military way against military aggression from the outside. That is not my idea about the matter at all, and I was curious to know just exactly how that conclusion is arrived at.

In article 22 of the covenant of the League of Nations, dealing with the subject of mandates, is the following paragraph:

Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory.

It occurred to me that that would necessarily exclude military protection. Apparently military protection was not contemplated, at least at the time that paragraph of article 22 was framed.

But, Mr. President, a further provision of article 22 is to the effect that something in the nature of an organic act is to be provided for by the League of Nations. If the League of Nations should ask the United States to take this mandate, the United States, of course, could accept it conditionally, and it could insist as a condition that it would not be obliged to render any military aid toward the preservation of the integrity of Armenia; or it could enter into an arrangement to the effect that the other nations, specifically designating them, should contribute toward the military aid, and so forth. In other words, it could lay down just exactly such terms and conditions as it saw fit with respect to military aid.

I inquire of the Senator from Missouri where we get the idea that the one prime first and chief consideration is that the United States must guard Armenia against all enemies, foreign and domestic?

Mr. SHIELDS. I would like to suggest to the Senator that it has been published in the press and repeatedly stated that the President, at the time this treaty was made, and the signatories agreed that this article should go into the covenant, promised, when the treaty was ratified, to take a mandate for Armenia, and in view of that he sent Maj. Gen. Harbord there to ascertain how much it would cost and what army would be required to stabilize and control it and protect it. Did not that mean that we were to send an army there?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am not able to tell the Senator anything at all about the truth or want of truth in current rumors, or newspaper reports, or anything of that kind. All I can judge by is the formal, authoritative declaration which was put into the covenant. I can not see from that, unless I shall be enlightened by the Senator from Missouri, how that necessarily implies that we are obliged, as I stated, to guard Armenia against all enemies, both foreign and domestic.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall take very great pleasure in replying to the Senator. But I must, in advance, say that I am astonished that the question should have been asked.

The point of the Senator from Montana is that all we agree to do under the terms of the treaty is to administer the affairs of Armenia. Will somebody please tell me how we can administer the affairs of Armenia while it is being overrun by an outside power, is being attacked, and there are armies marching across it?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I will undertake to tell the Senator. We could not do it.

Mr. REED. Of course not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, we could not do it. But that does not necessarily mean that the United States has to do it. Why should not an arrangement be entered into, as a condition of our accepting the mandate, under which France, Great Britain, Italy, Greece, Spain, and every other member of the league should contribute its quota of whatever military equipment and military aid is necessary in order to accomplish that end?

Mr. REED. Of course that, or almost any other thing we may imagine, is possible, but that is not what is proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just a sentence. It is proposed that the United States shall now accept the mandate, and the President has sent in a plain request that we now do accept the mandate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator will recognize that the mandate can not be accepted without the consent of the Congress of the United States. The President recognized that by sending his message here, and the Congress of the United States can attach just exactly such conditions as it may see fit.

Mr. REED. That is to say, we can refuse to go in at all—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Unless these other nations aid us in the matter of the military protection of the country.

Mr. REED. Certainly we can refuse to go in at all; or we can consent to send a single individual to act as governor general or adviser, or we can send only a sergeant and a couple of privates, or we can do any other thing which would be absolutely ineffective, and we might call that a mandate, but it would only be a farce.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Not at all. We can prescribe just exactly what we are willing to do.

Mr. REED. Yes; but that is not what is understood here; and it is not what England understands or France understands or anybody else understands.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But what is the difference what they understand? It is what we understand. We tell them what we are willing to do; we will administer the affairs of Armenia as contemplated in this action, provided—

Mr. REED. Provided—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Provided we get the requisite military assistance from the other powers.

Mr. REED. We might say that we would administer it provided they would furnish all the military force.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, we might say that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not propose to discuss this question on the theory on which half the defense of this League of Nations has been made. Every time we have brought men face to face with the responsibilities of the League of Nations they have invariably said, "While we agree to do something, still we may hereafter repudiate that agreement. While we solemnly agree that we will protect the frontiers of every country on earth, still, because the Constitution says that we can not make war without the declaration of Congress, therefore we are safe to make such an agreement to make war, because we have the power to hereafter repudiate our obligation and most likely we will do so." I abominate such an argument; I repudiate any agreement that can only be defended upon the theory that we are to dishonor America by repudiating its plighted troth.

I do not propose to discuss a mandate in Armenia except upon the plain understanding which the world has and which we have, that whoever accepts the mandate accepts the responsibility that goes along with the mandate. I am going to discuss the question upon the basis of the report of the very man whom the President of the United States sent there, accompanied by

an expensive military commission. That commission traveled 10,000 miles in inspecting Armenia and made a report. The report bears internal evidence that it is favorable as possible to the scheme of a mandate. The report declared that we must put an army of 60,000 men in Armenia to begin with. What number we must thereafter send is "in the lap of the gods."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the Senator from Missouri that if the proposition of the Senator from Montana were incorporated, and we accepted this mandate on condition that England, France, Italy, and all the other nations in the league should furnish part of the military force necessary, it would naturally and logically follow that in every other mandate anywhere else on the face of the earth the United States would be expected to furnish some of the soldiers. So in the end we would have armies in every country where there was a mandate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I do not see that that follows at all.

Mr. NORRIS. It would follow, it seems to me, if the United States did its duty.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Why should it follow? Take South Africa, for instance. Great Britain is asked to take a mandate in a certain portion of South Africa. Of course, she will jump at the opportunity. She will say, "Yes; certainly we will take a mandate, and we will supply all of the military force necessary." Why should the United States be asked to furnish any military force?

Mr. NORRIS. But suppose England says, "We want the United States to send a regiment of soldiers there to help us, to be under our command," we will have to send them there if we ask England to send her troops to Armenia.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We would be at perfect liberty to decline, just as Great Britain would be at perfect liberty to decline to send her quota to Armenia. That is a matter for herself to determine.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. She is under no obligation whatever to do it, and no degree of reprehension can attach to her if she deems it inadvisable.

Mr. NORRIS. But in that case there would be no mandate in Armenia, if accepted on that condition. We can not ask other nations to do what we would refuse to do if they asked us.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is a singular situation which is presented. The United States is asked now and here to pass a resolution authorizing the President to accept the mandate. That was the request proffered to the President, and that was his request of the Congress. The Senator from Montana says, "Yes; we can accept a mandate, but upon the terms and conditions that all of the armies and all of the navies shall be furnished by others than ourselves, if we want to." Or, "We can accept the mandate upon the condition that the others shall contribute their share." That would not be an American mandate. That would be a mandate by many nations. That would be a joint agreement by many people. It would not be an American mandate.

Let us extend it. I will follow the line of thought of the Senator from Nebraska. Here is a proposition to take mandates over a large part of the earth's surface, over many millions of people. France has already accepted a mandate over Syria. She is not asking us to send troops there. She is taking care of that. She has assumed the rôle of guardian, or of boss, or of conqueror, or whatever you want to call her.

England has taken Mesopotamia. She has assumed full charge there, sent her troops there, and undertakes to control there.

Now we are asked to take charge of the so-called Republic of Armenia. The plain intendment of the whole business is that we will do in Armenia exactly what is being done by France and England, the one in Syria and the other in Mesopotamia.

What a ridiculous thing it would be for us to say under these circumstances, "Yes; we will accept a mandate in Armenia, but we will not do anything"; or "We will accept a mandate in Armenia, and you must furnish the troops and the ships"; or "We will accept a mandate in Armenia, and you must furnish two-thirds of the ships and the men, and we will call ourselves the mandatory."

Mr. President, it is useless to attempt to confuse the question. Its proponents can find no refuge in technicalities or behind imaginary possibilities that everybody knows will never occur. The proposition is that we shall assume the responsibility in Armenia, and the whole responsibility.

Let us see. England had troops in Armenia, and England withdrew them. She said, "We will take care of Mesopotamia,

and no more." France had troops in Armenia, and she withdrew them. She said, "We will take care of Syria, and no more." England took jurisdiction over Palestine. She did not take a mandate in Persia; she took Persia. Then she went north of the new territory of Armenia as mapped out, and she took Caucasus as is indicated on the map clear up to the sea of Azov. She seized that territory because it embraced the rich oil fields of Batum and Baku. There was left Armenia, a country of mountains and waste places. The question was asked in the British Parliament why England had not continued in Armenia? This is what Lloyd-George said on the 29th day of April, speaking to Parliament. I read a press account which has never been disputed:

Dealing with the Turkish treaty he (Lloyd-George) added little to what is already known from Mons. Millerand's speech, and declared that neither Great Britain, France, nor Italy was able to undertake a mandate for Armenia because it would have involved heavy military resources for a great conquest if the Armenians were to have anything more than a paper Armenia.

There are numerous other similar statements which I do not wish to put in the Record, because I do not want to incur the burden of a vast number of statements.

But, Mr. President, the whole question of whether an armed force is necessary under the mandate to protect Armenia is settled by Gen. Harbord's report to the President, which is as follows:

(c) *The first duty of a mandatory would be to guarantee the safety of life and property through the country, and to this end its earliest efforts should be directed to the establishment of a native rural police or constabulary for the suppression of brigandage, outlawry, and other crimes outside the towns.*

(d) *Considering the uncertain character of the neighboring populations, the traditional lawlessness of migratory Kurds and Arabs, and the isolation of certain regions where the temptation to reprisals for past wrongs will be strong for at least a generation, a certain force must be kept in hand to supplement the native constabulary when needed.*

Gen. Harbord later declares that the force must be at least 60,000 men.

I shall later show how inadequate such a force may be.

Now, in view of that statement will the Senator from Montana say that does not require an army, and will he say that France and Italy and England are to furnish that army when they have already said they will not do it, and that they can not do it, that the expense is so great that they can not carry it? Will he so declare, in the face of the report of the President's representative, Gen. Harbord?

I regret having to debate a question that is so obvious and plain. I am sorry that a statement should have been made on this floor calculated to mislead the American people as to the gravity of the undertaking they are asked to assume.

Mr. President, this brings me to the question, What is the new Armenia? I have presented here a map prepared in the War College, which gives the best outline of Armenia, as proposed, which can be made under existing circumstances. Mark you, the boundaries of Armenia have not yet been definitely fixed.

The President of the United States has been asked to mark them out, I suppose upon the theory that the farther a man is away from a job the more he knows about it.

This country lies 6,000 miles from our shores. The proposed Armenia embraces a large part of what was formerly Turkey. In fact, the Turkish Empire is cut in two and a part of it is denominated Armenia. To this has been added, toward the east and northeast, another large body of land formerly under Russian control. The whole comprises a strip of land extending from the Mediterranean almost to the Caspian Sea. It lies immediately north of Syria, Mesopotamia, and Persia. As I have stated, the Turkish Empire is thus cut in two. Perhaps I can do no better service than to call attention to the facts regarding the character of this population.

I read from the bottom of page 7 of Gen. Harbord's report as printed in Senate Document No. 266, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session:

We estimate that there are probably 270,000 Armenians to-day in Turkish Armenia.

Two hundred and seventy thousand, little more than one-half the population of Washington.

Some 75,000 have been repatriated from the Syrian and Mesopotamian side, and others are slowly returning from other regions, and some from one cause or another remained in the country. There are in the Transcaucasus probably 300,000 refugees from Turkish Armenia, and some thousands more in other lands, for they have drifted to all parts of the Near East.

We estimate a total of perhaps half a million refugee Armenians as available to eventually begin life anew in a region about the size of New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, to which would be added those not refugees, who might return from other lands.

This transcaucasian region is ethnographically one of the most complicated in the world. In all ages it has been one of the great highways for mankind. Here stragglers and racial remnants have lodged during all the centuries that the tides of migration have swept the base of the great Caucasus Range, until to-day its small area contains five great racial groups, divided into some 40 distinct races. Nine of these have arrived in comparatively recent times, but the remaining 31 are more or less indigenous. There are here 25 purely Caucasian races. This racial diversity is complicated by the fact that with the exception of the fairly compact group of Georgians and one of Tartars these peoples are inextricably commingled throughout the region. Their civilization varies from the mountain savage to individuals of the highest types. Of the 40 distinct races the most important groups are the Georgians, the Azarbaijanese Tartars, and the Armenians.

A Transcaucasian confederation formed by all the peoples in that region was followed by an alignment in three small Republics, Georgia, Azarbaijan, and Armenia. Georgia is Christian, and its Iberian population are in the majority; Azarbaijan is Tartar and Moslem; Armenia is made up of the former provinces that composed Russian Armenia, less the part that went to Azarbaijan in the split, and the majority of its people are the blood brothers of the Armenians of Turkey in Asia. These Republics have been recognized by none of the powers except Turkey. The Armenian Republic seeks at the peace conference a union with the Turkish Armenians and the creation of an Armenian State, to include Russian Armenia and the six Turkish Vilayets (Van, Bitlis, Diarbekir, Kharput, Sivas, Erzerum) and Cilicia, to be governed by a mandatory of the great powers during a transition state of a term of years, in which Armenians of the dispersion may return to their homes and a constituent assembly be held to determine the form of the eventual permanent Government. Georgia and Azarbaijan ask independence at the peace conference, with certain adjustments of disputed boundaries in which all Transcaucasia is interested.

Both Georgia and Azarbaijan, living on the salvage from the wreck of Russia, have persuaded themselves that the civilization and governmental and business machinery they have taken over have been theirs from the beginning. The Georgians, with a church of their own antedating that of Russia and traditions of a Georgian dynasty of Armenian origin which reigned in Tiflis for a thousand years before Russia took over the country in 1802, are a very proud and plausible race.

I call the attention of the Senate to this:

They have been much influenced by the proximity of bolshevism, fly the red flag of revolution over their own, and have nationalized land, taking it from the original owners without compensation, to sell to peasants.

Mr. President, I shall not take time to go into details much further regarding these peoples. Already bolshevism has its fangs fastened upon them; they like the poison and have adopted it.

Already they are at war with each other. This morning's Washington Post contains the following telegram:

CONSTANTINOPLE, May 27.

The seven-day armistice between the republics of Georgia and Azarbaijan was broken four days after it had gone into effect, according to messages from Tiflis to-day.

The entire situation in the Caucasus has become so orientally complex that even the sharpest of Western minds here seem unable to comprehend it. Foreign observers in Georgia and Armenia, however, offer no hope that good for Armenia is coming out of it.

A message received by the nationalists from the general commanding their troops in Erzerum says the Russian bolsheviks have advised him that they are sending two divisions of Russian soviet troops to Erzerum across Persia. This message, however, is regarded as questionable by the foreign military men in Constantinople.

However that may be, if they are not now marching we may anticipate their speedy advance.

There is another dispatch, under the date of May 30, from Paris to the Temps, from Tiflis, Transcaucasia, which says:

The soviets at Baku have been removed from power by the bolshevik emissary Pankratof, who was sent from Moscow. The dispatch adds that foreigners at Baku, particularly British, have been imprisoned or detained.

The petroleum industry has been organized on a large scale in Astrakhan in order to supply soviet Russia by way of the Volga River. The dispatch says no bolshevik attacks on Georgia or Armenia have been recorded.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if it will not disturb the Senator from Missouri, I desire to ask him a question merely for information. The Senator is aware that the supreme council, the San Remo conference, the league, or some other body invited the President to delimit Armenia, to lay down its boundaries; but I understand that that is only within certain limits, that the President is not to be allowed to touch certain Provinces to which Armenia lays claim, but is to operate only within a restricted area. Has the Senator from Missouri heard anything about the President's power in that regard?

Mr. REED. I have not. The fact is we have so much secret diplomacy going on in these days of "open covenants openly arrived at" that nobody except the men in the secret knows just what is going on. Nevertheless, the Senate and the House of Representatives are invited to shut their eyes, open their mouths and swallow what is put to their lips. This, however, is what the President says in his message:

I may add for the information of the Congress that at the same sitting it was resolved to request the President of the United States to undertake to arbitrate the difficult question of the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in the Vilayets of Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, and it was agreed to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulation he may prescribe as to access to the sea for the independent State of Armenia.

The language seems to place a limit upon the President's authority. It is, however, so vague no man can determine with-

out further data the extent to which the President may go. I can not more definitely answer the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I take it that he does not have the information, or he would not have asked me the question; and if he does not possess the information, then I assume nobody in the Senate has it, and perhaps nobody outside the White House and the "Big Three," who are now dividing up the world, can answer the Senator's question.

Let us for a moment further consider the hornet's nest which we are invited to enter. The country over which we are asked to accept a mandate is surrounded by over 250,000,000 Mohammedans; on every side it is bounded by Mohammedans. It may be interesting to some of the Members of the Senate to know that Mohammedanism is gaining proselytes faster probably than is Christianity. Proselyting for the Mohammedan faith has been going on for a long period of time. Its activities for a decade have been enormously multiplied.

The central thought of this faith is the ultimate unity of the Moslem world. The inspiring motives are two: An adherence to the doctrines of Mahomet, constituting the spiritual impulse; the final dominance of Mohammedans over the entire earth constituting the political impulse. To this end they have organized themselves into secret societies, having a head which appears to be in absolute control. In accordance with a final and intelligent plan they are exploring Europe and Asia in search of learning in every branch of science. Especially are they keen to acquire a knowledge of military and naval science.

It must be remembered that these people are not to be despised because they have been temporarily put down by the superior arms of the white nations. No page of history is more replete with valorous military achievement than that which contains the record of the Moslems.

May I not beg you to keep in mind that statesmen in regarding world problems must not judge by the immediate present nor, indeed, by the immediate future. They must think in decades and in centuries. They must remember that a race of men to-day inert and an easy prey may to-morrow spring at the throats of their oppressors. Accordingly we must not forget that the ancestors of the present-day Mussulman once penetrated to the very heart of Europe and threatened the extinction of Christian civilization.

Let us not forget that the descendants of these conquerors are as brave as their ancestors. In recent years they have with admirable courage marched to battle. Only the superiority of British cannon and British discipline has enabled her armies to withstand the assaults of men who believed that death upon the first battle insured a life of eternal bliss.

It will not do to say that they are a people without genius. The architecture of the Moors excited the admiration of the world. It will not do to say that they are devoid of religion, for although they follow a creed which we regard as heresy, it nevertheless has stood the test of a thousand years. Embraced within it are some of the most beautiful tenets that have ever inspired the soul of man. Let those who talk about "the unspeakable Turk," who treat with contumely the Moor, who refer in scorn to the Mohammedan religion, remember that it counts as its adherents 250,000,000 of the earth's inhabitants. Will such a people thus united by religion and largely of blood kin forever submit to robbery, to plunder, and to mastery?

What has been perpetrated against them? England concluded she wanted Egypt. She took it at the point of the sword. Was there opposition? We heard but little of it; and yet, sir, in 1915 England had to withdraw enormous forces from points on the front where they were needed in order to put down the rebellions that were started.

But for a moment let me digress from that immediate thought. France, without any more title to the country than the United States had, proceeded by armed force to take possession of immense territories in Algiers. It was an act of robbery, by force major, pure and simple, and England but recently, with the hand of steel, wearing, it is true, the glove of diplomacy, has taken possession of Persia. By the sword she has seized Mesopotamia.

I think we may say that last act is justifiable as a punishment for the war, and that there is a title, a war title, a blood title, to that land. France has taken Syria. They call it a mandate, but it is an armed invasion and an armed holding. Again, that title of France, based upon this war, may have some kind of a justification in our minds. These, however, are only a few of the instances of cold-blooded and deliberate invasion and robbery that have been going on for many years.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am very much interested in that view expressed by the Senator, and in no little sympathy with him; but the Turkish Empire is all broken up. Now, just exactly what would the Senator do?

Mr. REED. That is a complete digression from my theme. I shall be glad to try to answer, a little later, just what I would do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Very well.

Mr. REED. I am discussing now not so much the question of what we have taken in the war as what had been going on before.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator is making some rather severe charges against one of our allies—France, for instance—for taking over Syria—

Mr. REED. No; I did not. I said she possibly had a title to that through this war.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, yes; but the Senator, notwithstanding that, can not escape the suggestion that his language was rather severely condemnatory of France for having taken over Syria, and of England for taking over Mesopotamia.

Mr. REED. Oh, no, Mr. President. My language is in the Record, and it was expressly to the effect that they probably had a title to this land, and probably a justification for taking it. It was taken as the spoils of war.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That is the point. The Senator was conveying the impression that as the spoils of war they had grabbed these territories.

Mr. REED. Very well. If the Senator will wait until I have reached my conclusion, I do not believe he will quarrel with the deduction I draw.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But the Senator will bear in mind that that was all Turkey.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand that it was Turkey.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And it is a simple question as to whether we will allow Turkey to continue as the sovereign of that entire territory.

Mr. REED. Exactly. The doctrine of self-determination is working at full force. I am, however, discussing a theme a little different from what the Senator has in mind. I am talking particularly about the repeated acts before the war. It is true I mentioned the fact that England and France had, as the result of the war, taken Syria and Armenia. I am, however, especially inviting attention to the fact that prior to the war England, France, and Italy had invaded the territories of the Moslem people and had taken over vast stretches of territory. That was done by Great Britain in Egypt. While until recently she kept up a pretense of allowing Egyptian government, it was only a pretense. Her adviser was an autocrat whose advice Egypt was forced to accept.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, does the Senator know exactly where the Italian holding is? It is not shown on that map.

Mr. REED. It is in Tripoli, in Africa. It is not in the part of the world shown on the map now exhibited.

Mr. LODGE. I see.

Mr. REED. I am speaking of the Moslem world as a whole, not of Turkey. I have already said that this Moslem world is bound together by a religious tie, and I am not dreaming. I am voicing a fear that has been expressed by the statesmen of the world for many years, viz, that these continued wrongs and outrages are the seed from which a bloody crop will some day be harvested.

Returning now to a theme that I started to discuss a moment ago, I challenge attention to the fact that the Moslem world is united, and in the most dangerous way united, that the menace is present, and that at any time it may become manifested in a tremendous uprising. In proof I refer to the fact that serious uprisings actually occurred during the recent war. I am reading now from a book just from the press, entitled "The Rising Tide of Color against White World Supremacy," by Lothrop Stoddard, of Harvard, author of a number of excellent books, with an introduction by Madison Grant, author and writer on races of men.

In discussing the spirit of Moslem protest throughout the world the author states:

Europe's conquests of Africa and central Asia toward the close of the last century, and the subsequent Anglo-French agreement mutually appropriating Egypt and Morocco, evoked murmurs of impotent fury from the Moslem world. Under such circumstances the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 sent a feverish tremor throughout Islam.

Here follows a discussion of the relation of the movement to Japan. The author continues:

In 1911 came Italy's barefaced raid on Turkey's African dependency of Tripoli. So bitter was the anger in all Mohammedan lands at this unprovoked aggression that many European observers became seriously alarmed.

"Why has Italy found 'defenseless' Tripoli such a hornet's nest?" queried Gabriel Hanotaux, a former French minister of foreign affairs.

"It is because she has to do, not merely with Turkey, but with Islam as well. Italy has set the ball rolling—so much the worse for her—and for us all." But the Tripoli expedition was only the beginning of the Christian assault; for next year came the Balkan War, which sheared away Turkey's European holdings to the walls of Constantinople and left her crippled and discredited. At these disasters a cry of wrathful anguish swept the world of Islam from end to end. Here is how a leading Indian Moslem interpreted the Balkan conflict:

"The King of Greece orders a new crusade. From the London chancelleries rise calls to Christian fanaticism, and St. Petersburg already speaks of the planting of the cross on the dome of Saint Sophia. To-day they speak thus; to-morrow they will thus speak of Jerusalem and the Mosque of Omar. Brothers! Be ye of one mind, that it is the duty of every true believer to hasten beneath the Khalifa's banner and to sacrifice his life for the safety of the faith." And another Indian Moslem leader thus adjured the British authorities: "I appeal to the present Government to change its anti-Turkish attitude before the fury of millions of Moslem fellow subjects is kindled to a blaze and brings disaster."

Still more significant were the appeals made by the Indian Moslems to their Brahman fellow countrymen, the traditionally despised "idolaters." These appeals betokened a veritable revolution in outlook, as can be gauged from the text of one of them, significantly entitled, "The Message of the East." "Spirit of the East," reads this noteworthy document, "arise and repel the swelling flood of Western aggression! Children of Hindustan, aid us with your wisdom, culture, and wealth; lend us your power, the birthright and heritage of the Hindu! Let the spirit powers hidden in the Himalayan Mountain peaks arise. Let prayers to the god of battles float upward; prayers that right may triumph over might; and call to your myriad gods to annihilate the armies of the foe!" In China also the same fraternizing spirit was visible. During the republican revolution, the Chinese Mohammedans, instead of holding jealously aloof, co-operated wholeheartedly with their Buddhist and Confucian fellow citizens, and Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen, the republican leader, announced gratefully: "The Chinese will never forget the assistance which their Moslem compatriots have rendered in the interest of order and liberty."

I am coming now to the matter that I wanted particularly to challenge attention to:

The Great War thus found Islam deeply stirred against European aggression, keenly conscious of its own solidarity and frankly reaching out for colored allies in the projected struggle against white domination.

Under these circumstances it may at first sight appear strange that no general Islamic explosion occurred when Turkey entered the lists at the close of 1914, and the Sultan-Khalifa issued a formal summons to the holy war. Of course, this summons was not the flat failure which allied reports led the west to believe at the time. As a matter of fact there was trouble in practically every Mohammedan land under allied control. To name only a few of many instances: Egypt broke into a tumult, smothered only by overwhelming British reinforcements; Tripoli burst into a flame of insurrection that drove the Italians headlong to the coast; Persia was prevented from joining Turkey only by prompt Russian intervention; and the Indian northwest frontier was the scene of fighting that required the presence of a quarter of a million Anglo-Indian troops. The British Government has officially admitted that during 1915 the Allies' Asiatic and African possessions stood within a hand's breadth of a cataclysmic insurrection.

That is the hornet's nest into which we are invited. Land after land has been taken by the sword. Peoples after peoples have been brought into subjection, a rule by martial law substantially established. The fires of hate have been set burning in the hearts of 250,000,000 people. Revolt after revolt has occurred; revolt after revolt will occur so long as these people cling to their faith, so long as they have the blood of courage in their veins.

Now, sir, the proposition is that there shall be carved out a strip of territory substantially extending from the Caspian to the Black Sea and stretching southward to the Mediterranean. That strip of territory cuts the Moslem world in two. It is proposed that America shall assume the control and the management of the country thus created. With all due respect to any critic who splits hairs and cavils at phraseology, I say that whoever accepts the mandate must defend the country.

That means, sir, that if the Moslem world shall seek to throw off the thralldom of England, France, or Italy, the soldiers of the United States will form the wall of flesh and blood which will be expected to break the force of the Moslem assault.

Gen. Harbord has been sent to Armenia to investigate conditions. I pass no reflection upon Gen. Harbord, but whoever reads his report will see that as far as possible he undertook to sustain a mandate in Armenia. I shall try to call attention to the evidence of that in a few moments.

Yet he states there must be 60,000 troops there at the present time. Now, let us see what is likely to happen if we have 60,000 American boys in this worse than a cockpit of the world, in this bloody forum every inch of which is saturated with the gore which has been poured from the veins of men for 3,000 years.

There will be an attack. These people are never at peace. I have already shown that the new republics, or so-called republics, are at war at this present hour.

But, more than that, we have great Russia to reckon with. Russia controls, and for many years has controlled, a large section of this territory. To-day she is engaged in a war within her own borders, in a war with Poland, the result of which is that practically all her energies are there concentrated; and yet it appears, from the articles I have read, that she has still

time and energy to send men, if not to send troops, into this very country. Is there a sane man on this earth who believes that Russia will forever be in trouble; that 180,000,000 people, who have maintained a civilization and a strong central government for centuries of time, is now wiped out; and that it is no longer a potential factor in the world's business?

Is there a sane man anywhere who believes that when Russia has reestablished peace within her own borders she will not create a central government of strength and power? Again, is there a sane man who believes that such a power will submit to the ravishment of the lands of Russia, and that England will be permitted to keep the Caucasus without a fight?

It follows, therefore, as day follows the night, that this territory which was Russian, Russia will again demand, and our little Army of 60,000 troops will be instantly in peril. We will be the mandatory, and if we are the mandatory, the protector, it will be our business to repel an invasion by Russia. The moment a Russian soldier sets foot upon soil which is under our mandate, that soldier will be engaged by an American soldier.

Blood will be spilled, and the cry will go that we must avenge the blood of our soldiers. Thus we will be drawn into a world war because Great Britain has seized oil fields on soil under Russian territory or within its zone of influence.

What right have we to rob Russia? She lost 6,000,000 men fighting against Germany. She fought until she was exhausted and then she withdrew. Her withdrawal was not an act of dishonor to the United States, for she had no promises to us. Her withdrawal can hardly be said to be an act of dishonor to any nation, for she quit through exhaustion. Then she set up a government which we do not like, but that is not our business unless, indeed, we are to set up a league of nations and govern everybody, and whoever undertakes that is undertaking the office of God Almighty himself, for He alone has the power or is entitled to control the races of men.

But, sir, how long will it be until there will be trouble in Persia? There is a wonderful people. They were old and their civilization had adorned the earth when our ancestors were savages of the forest. They are not dead—perhaps they do not even sleep. Will Syria and Mesopotamia wear their chains always and without protest? I tell you, sir, that those people are as certain to resist as are the Irish certain to resist until their chains are broken. No people with any pride of character will long submit to a government established over them by men of a different race and religion. Every sentiment of their souls will rebel, every impulse of their manhood will protest.

But, sir, what of the interior of this country? What do we undertake there? A very small proportion of the people of the country that we propose to take over are Armenians. What of the Armenians? I belong to that class of men who never attack a race as a race, for I know of no race that has ever attained to any degree of civilization that has not possessed many virtues and that has not produced some men of such eminence that they would adorn any other country by their presence and citizenship. But when we speak of this question, we must consider the aggregate, and what of the Armenian in the aggregate?

To begin with, if he was the right kind of man, speaking broadly, the things that have occurred never could have happened. We are told that Armenians have been slaughtered, entire families put to death, without a hand being raised. We read stories of Turkish soldiers coming to a home, murdering the entire family, including the husband and father, like so many pigs, and that no one was killed save the Armenians. That would not be possible with our race. If a massacre were proclaimed in this country by some dominant race we might be massacred, but our lives would be sold and paid for 10 to 1.

It has happened many times in our history—little frontier settlements of only a few men and women in the forest have been attacked by overwhelming hordes of savages—but whoever heard of an American frontiersman laying down his gun while the Indians slit his wife's throat and scalped his children? Always we read the story of windows barred and doors closed and of firing until the last bullet was gone; then of the battle with the clubbed rifle until the defender of the home was stretched stark upon the sword. Then, and not until then, did they get at his wife and babies.

But I step aside for a moment to call attention to the evidence of the character of this people, and as I do so I challenge your thought to the statement I made a moment ago—that Gen. Harbord wrote as favorable report as he could. I find here page after page devoted to the most pathetic accounts of the slaughter of Armenians and the cruelties of the Turks. They are painted not so much with the pen of the

military writer, who generally deals in hard, cold facts without ornamentation, but rather they are expressed by the brush of a master artist of diction, who has expended all of his ability in portraying the awful experiences of the Armenians, and then, presented in a single sentence, is a fearful statement; I give it as a picture of the Armenians by the friend of the Armenians. The author has just concluded this graphic depiction of Turkish cruelties, of women ravished, of children starved, of houses burned, of cities plundered, and of people dragged into slavery or worse than slavery by the Turks. Then comes this statement:

In the territory untouched by war from which Armenians were deported the ruined villages are undoubtedly due to Turkish deviltry, but where Armenians advanced and retired with the Russians their retaliatory cruelties unquestionably rivaled the Turks in their inhumanity.

Perhaps I was wrong in saying that this was a single sentence, for my attention was called to the fact that elsewhere Gen. Harbord makes similar statements, as for instance:

The Armenian is not guiltless of blood himself; his memory is long and reprisals are due, and will doubtless be made if opportunity offers. Racially allied to the wild Aryan Kurd, he is cordially hated by the latter. Kurds appealed to this mission with tears in their eyes to protect them from Armenians who had driven them from their villages, appealing to be allowed to go back to their homes for protection against the rigorous winter now rapidly approaching on the high interior plateau. The Kurds claim that many of their people were massacred under the most cruel circumstances by Armenian irregulars accompanying the Russian Bolsheviks when the Russian Army went to pieces after the collapse of the empire.

Similar claim is made by the people of Erzerum, who point to burned buildings in which hundreds of Turks perished, and by the authorities of Hassan-Kala, who give the number of villages destroyed by the Armenians in their great plain as 43. According to British Consul Stevens, at Batum, these statements were verified by a commission which examined into the allegations and on which Armenians had a representation. In Baku the massacre of 2,000 Azarbaijanese by Armenians in March, 1918, was followed by the killing of 4,000 Armenians by Azarbaijanese in November of the same year.

So that it is a case of eastern barbarism on both sides, each of them responding to the hate of centuries, each of them pursuing the same methods and tactics. Over this cesspool of criminality, of cruelty, of villainy, of race hatred the United States is asked to assume control, and to do it because the countries that have, speaking broadly, stolen the lands of these people all over the world decline to take control because it is expensive. As usual—and I am going to use the slang expression, as much as it may be out of place in the Senate—Uncle Sam is to “hold the sack.”

In summing up the reasons, pro and con, on the Armenian mandate, Gen. Harbord's report reckons the cost as follows:

13. The first duty of America is to its own people and its nearer neighbors.

Our country would be involved in this adventure for at least a generation, and in counting the cost Congress must be prepared to advance some such sums, less such amount as the Turkish and Transcaucasian revenues could afford, for the first five years, as follows:

FIRST YEAR.	
General government	\$100,000,000
Communications, railroads, etc.	20,000,000
Relief, repatriation, education, etc.	50,000,000
Army and Navy	88,500,000
Sanitation	17,000,000
Total	275,500,000
SECOND YEAR.	
General government	75,000,000
Communications, railroads, etc.	20,000,000
Relief, education, etc.	18,000,000
Army and Navy	59,000,000
Sanitation, etc.	7,264,000
Total	174,264,000
THIRD YEAR.	
General government	50,000,000
Communications, railroads, etc.	20,000,000
Relief, education, etc.	4,500,000
Army and Navy	44,250,000
Sanitation, etc.	5,000,000
Total	123,750,000
FOURTH YEAR.	
General government	25,000,000
Communications, railroads, etc.	20,000,000
Relief, education, etc.	4,500,000
Army and Navy	44,250,000
Sanitation, etc.	3,000,000
Total	96,750,000
FIFTH YEAR.	
General government	15,000,000
Communications, railroads, etc.	20,000,000
Relief, education, etc.	4,500,000
Army and Navy	44,250,000
Sanitation, etc.	2,000,000
Total	85,750,000

SUMMARY.

Total first year	\$275,500,000
Total second year	174,264,000
Total third year	123,750,000
Total fourth year	96,750,000
Total fifth year	85,750,000
Grand total	756,014,000

As to the number of troops necessary for this mandatory Gen. Harbord states:

Estimates of the necessary number of mandatory troops vary greatly—from 25,000 to 200,000. Conditions change so rapidly that plans made to-day for the use of troops might be obsolete in six months. Uncertainty as to the time the mandate will be tendered and accepted makes estimates merely approximate. Under conditions as they exist to-day the undersigned believes that a force of two American divisions, with several hundred extra officers, or a total force of 59,000, would be ample. Such force would be specially organized—one aeroplane squadron; a minimum of artillery; not to exceed one regiment of 75's, motorized; a minimum of the special services; four times the usual number of sanitary troops; four regiments of Cavalry, with minor changes in organization, at the discretion of the senior general officer on duty with the mandatory government. This force should be substantially reduced at the end of two years, and by 50 per cent at the end of the third year. After that some further reduction could be slowly effected, but the irreducible minimum would be reached at about the strength of one division.

The annual cost for the force of the Army above stated would be at the maximum:

For the first year	\$88,500,000
At the end of two years perhaps	59,000,000
At the end of three years	44,250,000

with thereafter a continuing appropriation of that sum less such amount as the local revenues could afford, probably a very substantial fraction of the cost.

A more monstrous proposition was never put before the American people. If you undertake it, do it with your eyes open. We are to send an army of 60,000 men; they are to hold a people in subjection who, the moment the Turkish yoke was broken, set upon each other for mutual extermination. This army will be in the center of 250,000,000 Moslems, whose hearts are filled with hate of our very race.

For my part, sir, I am not willing to send a single man, unless we send a million men. They will be far from their base of supplies, far from reinforcements. They will be liable to annihilation at the hands of overwhelming forces of fanatics, who believe that God speaks through their representatives, and that when they are called to the field of battle and to death, they are also called to the bosom of Allah.

If we send an Army, it must be strong enough to withstand all attacks. Even a million men can not do that. There are 22,000,000 Turks in Turkey alone; there are, I think, approximately 15,000,000 people in Persia; there are 22,000,000 in Egypt; there are vast numbers of Moslems inhabiting Russia, Turkestan, India, Arabia, and Western China. To send 60,000 men there may be to send them to slaughter. Certain it is that so long as they are there, there can not be anywhere in Asia a serious disturbance without imperiling their safety; there can be no attack on Armenia unless they are drawn into it. As I have said, when once they are drawn in, when once a single American soldier has shed his blood, then America must stand back of the issue.

Mr. President, what of this new madness, this “new era,” this “new magic,” that this country should go forth into all the world and impose its will upon millions of God's creatures everywhere? We believe that we have the best form of government; they believe that they have the best form of government. We believe we have the true religion; they believe they have the true religion. We follow the cross; they follow the crescent. We have our habits of home life; they have theirs. Shall we undertake to impose our will upon them? Why, then, pray, have they not an equal right to impose their will upon us?

If you establish the doctrine that all races of men have the right to set up their own government, if you adhere to the immortal principle that “all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed,” then each race of men will stay at home, set up their own government, attend to their own business, insist upon it as a right, defend it with their fortunes and their lives, and the world will grow to greatness and may remain at peace; but if once you strike down that eternal principle of justice, then, sir, you have destroyed it as a defense to yourselves; you return the world to the old doctrine that caused many of the bloody wars of history, that a nation has the right to go forth to impose its form of government and its kind of religion upon other races or nations.

Then will recur the struggles and the battles—the bloody and fearsome wars—that have drenched the old earth in the blood of countless millions.

Are we to go to Armenia because some of her people—a minority of them—have our religion in some sort of form? We might as well, then, go to Russia, for they have our religion in an

equally pure form. They, too, are Christians. We might follow the church and the missionary into every land beneath the sun and proceed to take possession because there are some people there who belong to our faith. And where, pray, will that bring us? Back to the doctrine of the old Spanish conquistador. He carried the cross of Christ in one hand, but in the other was a blood-dripping sword. He pretended to make his conquests in the name of the meek and lowly and gentle Jesus, but he proceeded with the instrumentalities of hell, and he made an inferno of the earth wherever he marched.

Dare you accept the doctrine that because there are some people in a distant land who claim to belong to our religious faith we are therefore to take possession of that country? I challenge any man to accept that doctrine, for if it is accepted then we must to-morrow put the draft in execution; we must man our ships of war, start our factories making poison gases and the instrumentalities of destruction, and move upon Japan, for Japan has taken Korea, and in Korea there are many Christians. I have heretofore quoted upon the floor from the reports made by the two missionary associations to the effect that Japan with the sword overcame the ancient kingdom of Korea, and is now engaged officially in the business of persecuting the Christians; that Christian churches have been given to torch; that Christian men, because they were Christians, had steel rings forced upon their arms until the blood was driven back into the surcharged heart and they died in an agony equal to the crucifixion; that Christian women have been stripped naked and beaten with bamboo rods until the flesh dropped from their bones and they died in infinite torment.

If you are to establish this doctrine, then extend it, and let us have a mandate in Korea; let us put American soldiers in that land; let us have a religious war between Japan and the United States.

We are asked to enter upon this mandate while the gravest tasks at home remain unfulfilled. Eleven per cent of our people are unable to read and write; our school-teachers paid wages that frequently are not the equivalent of the hire of the ordinary servant girl. Our school children are insufficiently supplied with textbooks. All this in a land the government of which rests upon the intelligence of the governed.

Here, sir, are unexampled resources not yet developed, rivers to be harnessed, swamp lands to be reclaimed, desert stretches to be irrigated, wonderful natural resources not yet employed. Here are 20,000,000 acres of overflowed land in the Mississippi Valley alone as rich as is the soil of the treasured valley of the Nile, and yet when we came to the rivers and harbors appropriation we cut it to a meager \$12,000,000 upon the claim that the money could not be spared. The entire sum would, in my opinion, not support an army of 60,000 men in Armenia for one month's time. Here are our people driving over dirt roads, hauling produce to market over country lanes, wasting time and energies that are of incalculable account, because we have not sufficient money to build the highways of our land; but we are asked, like the foolish crusaders of medieval times, to go into other lands to waste our energies, playing cat's-paw for the designing rulers of the great nations of Europe.

But, sir, while we do all this there are not only ignorant people in our country but there are unfortunate people. There is not a city of this land where little children are not crowded together in hovels, where women are not working in sweatshops, where mothers are not looking through eyes blinded with tears at the pinched faces of the weans they love. There is not a place in all this land but contains some brain pinched by the vise of circumstances, of some child or youth denied development because there is not money enough to go around.

While this is the case we talk about sacrificing for other people—sacrificing for people who will execrate us for coming into their land, sacrificing for people the vast majority of whom do not want our interference. Even those on whose behalf we interfere will speedily turn against us.

Have we had no lesson from this war? How proud we were when, day after day, as we saw the boys go forth, we said, "They have a double mission. They will defend us, for our rights have been invaded, but in doing so they will help other nations." How glorious it seemed when we read the accounts of how they were being employed to strengthen the English and French lines until the terrible retreat was stopped. We proudly said, "It was the Americans who did that." Again, how proud we were as the gates of Paris were about to be assailed, and the order was "Retreat! Retreat!" and still "Retreat!" when an American officer said: "We did not come here to retreat; we came to advance, and I shall give the order, Forward." How glorious it seemed as St. Mihiel and Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood and the Argonne recorded each day an American victory, and how we all said: "In all the flight of the years to come, the flowers of love

for America will bloom in the hearts of the English, the French, the Belgians, and Italians." We fondly thought that friendship's holy bonds would forever unite us in a world fraternity.

And yet, sir, when you read the report of the British general he does not deign to mention the fact that America had anything to do with winning the war. There were three prizes in France—one for the Frenchman, one for the Englishman, and one for the Yankee, who was to be plucked. There are bills rendered for the rent of the soil on which our troops stood while they beat back the Germans marching upon Paris. If you read the last few issues of the papers you will find that British statesmen and British papers and French statesmen and French papers are denouncing us because we do not stay over there forever and continue to protect them. They have the sweet philosophy that "one good turn deserves another," by which they mean that if you help them once you are obligated to help them always.

Back to the old doctrine! Back to the doctrine of Washington, whose mighty brain encompassed the philosophy of human government! Back to the doctrine of nationalism, of Americanism, to the cultivation of friendly relations with all countries and entanglements with none!

Here on this land, sea girt and isolate from all the turmoils, the disturbances, the cruelties, and the wrongs of other lands, let us build an empire of human greatness and achievement, a Republic of equality based upon manhood, constitution, and law. Here let us remain, a shining light to all the world, a teacher by example and precept. Let our sword never be unsheathed except in defense of our own land, and, once drawn, let it never be returned to its scabbard while an American right remains unprotected or a wrong unavenged. That was the doctrine of Washington; it is the American doctrine; and it will triumph, because it is the eternal right.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUTHERLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington wish to ask for unanimous consent?

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding is that it is not necessary to ask for unanimous consent. I am making a motion that we proceed to the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would displace the pending business as set by the unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator can take up his bill by unanimous consent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. May I ask the Chair what were the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution affecting the Armenian matter is the unfinished business before the Senate and can be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding is that unless there has been a unanimous-consent agreement to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution until its conclusion it is in order at any time to move to proceed to the consideration of other business. Mere unanimous consent to take up a measure for consideration simply puts it in the place which any measure would have if taken up on a motion.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist on taking up the bill. The real understanding was to take this Armenian proposition up and dispose of it. If there is no one else who wants to speak on it, I want a vote now. I want to get it out of the way. I do not wish to interfere with anything the Senator wants to do, but I hope he will not insist upon taking up another matter. Some of us have important engagements to-morrow that have to do with the business of the Senate, and we would like to have the resolution disposed of to-day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very much disposed to comply with any request the Senator from Missouri makes, but I would like to have a further understanding as to just what is the situation in regard to the concurrent resolution. There was some colloquy on the floor of the Senate indicating a desire upon the part of Senators who were principally interested in the question that it should go over for a few days.

I notice now that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and other Senators who are especially interested in it, are not present. If it is the intention to dispose of the Armenian resolution at once, I would concur with the Senator from Missouri in desiring that that be done and that the motion which I have just suggested be deferred until a conclusion of that matter. But it was my understanding that it was the expectation of Senators

that the Armenian resolution should not be pressed to a conclusion to-day.

Mr. REED. The agreement, as I remember it, is that it shall be made the unfinished business, and that at not later than 4 o'clock to-morrow we shall vote upon it. I think the spirit of the understanding was that we would adhere to this one question. For instance, it was requested, and put in the agreement, that we would meet as early as 10 o'clock to-morrow and a time limit was put upon speeches.

Mr. KENYON. I would like to ask the Senator from Washington if this is a bill the consideration of which will probably take some time?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is a tariff bill, fixing a tariff upon magnesite.

Mr. KENYON. That probably will take some time. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that last Monday we passed what is known as the Nolan-Johnson minimum-wage bill. A motion has been made to reconsider the vote by which we passed that bill. The bill has already passed the House. If that bill is to be passed by this Congress and it has to go to conference it ought to be gotten out of the way. I do not want to oppose the Senator in bringing up his bill, but I gave notice some days ago that I would try to have that motion taken up. I do not know how much discussion it will bring about. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who made the motion, is willing to have it taken up at any time, and it ought to be disposed of. Matters which are going to conference, it seems to me, should have a little right of way.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is the situation in which this tariff bill would be in case any amendment should be added to it. If not, it would then be in a still more preferred class, of being upon final passage without amendment, the Senate agreeing to a House measure.

Mr. KENYON. It has passed the House?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has passed the House and has been reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate without amendment. All we desire to do is to get a vote on it. I understand there will be some discussion, but certainly there ought to be an opportunity for its consideration for a reasonable length of time. The occasion for making the motion was that the appearance of the Senate indicated that there would be no further immediate discussion of the Armenian resolution.

Mr. KENYON. I had not supposed that situation was going to arise. I have been sitting here waiting for some time, but I was two rows behind the Senator, and he was recognized first.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator will give us a reasonable length of time on this bill, we will join him in getting up the motion to reconsider.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, of course, under the unanimous-consent agreement we can only lay aside the Armenian resolution by unanimous consent. We can not possibly displace it without a breach of the agreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. During the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts I made some inquiry as to what is the unanimous-consent agreement. I have been unable to ascertain upon the record of the Senate any unanimous consent other than to take up for consideration the Armenian resolution. Of course, if the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to that resolution did not go to any further extent than taking it up for consideration, it can be laid aside on motion.

Mr. LODGE. That would displace it entirely.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Any measure which is under consideration can be displaced.

Mr. LODGE. There is no question about the understanding, for I stated it here, and Senators on the other side stated it. The only relaxation of it was that in case no one desired to discuss the Armenian resolution, it could be laid aside temporarily. If the Senator will read the whole of the unanimous-consent agreement, he will find that it provides—

That upon the said calendar day of Tuesday, June 1, 1920, the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock a. m.; and, further, that on the said calendar day no Senator shall speak in all more than 45 minutes upon the said resolution and any amendment or amendments offered thereto.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that relates to to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. It does. I assure the Senator the understanding was absolute that it should not be displaced before the time of taking the vote.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts, suppose no one desires to proceed?

Mr. LODGE. Then it can be laid aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. KENYON. I am anxious that we shall take up the motion to reconsider the vote on the Nolan-Johnson minimum-wage bill.

Mr. LODGE. So am I; I want very much to dispose of that motion.

Mr. KENYON. There is nothing in the unanimous-consent agreement which would prevent action on that motion.

Mr. LODGE. I fear it would not be in keeping with the unanimous-consent agreement if we did it by motion, because that would formally dispose of it. It was also understood that if no one wished to speak on the Armenian resolution, by unanimous consent, we could temporarily lay it aside.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gay	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Gerry	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Hale	McNary	Smoot
Calder	Harding	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Harris	New	Stanley
Chamberlain	Henderson	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Hitchcock	Overman	Sutherland
Comer	Jones, Wash.	Page	Swanson
Culberson	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Curtis	Keyes	Phipps	Townsend
Dial	King	Pittman	Underwood
Dillingham	Lenroot	Poin Dexter	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Lodge	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	McCormick	Reed	Warren
France	McCumber	Sheppard	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPEAL OF WAR-TIME LEGISLATION.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXVI, I move that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 4388) to repeal certain war-time legislation, and for other purposes, and the bill (S. 4389) to repeal certain war-time legislation. I ask that this motion lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will lie on the table.

GOOD ROADS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which is referred all legislation pertaining to good roads throughout the United States, and in view of the fact that there is now pending before that committee a bill which has been introduced by Senator TOWNSEND, of Michigan, the chairman of the committee, which will add to the great system of roads already completed many miles through the various States of the Union, I feel, as one who is deeply interested in the question of good roads, that the present is a good time to briefly outline, for general information, what has been done in this connection and what is proposed for the future.

The question of good roads has been the keystone of civilization. The Government that perpetuated itself longer than any other in history was ancient Rome, and after the conquest of the world Augustus laid the foundation broad and deep for the continuance of Roman dominion by establishing a system of post roads. These roads were largely built by the legions, and so perfect was their construction that it is really surprising how quickly news was transmitted over the roads radiating out from Rome to the most remote Provinces. The roads were first intended for Government use alone, but in a very short period they became the means of travel and commerce by the populace and enabled such intermingling of the peoples of the various component parts of the great empire that the "Golden age of Rome," or as it was called the "Hundred years of peace," was largely due to it. Over these roads a traveler could leave Rome and go to the city of Antioch, in Syria, in less than six days. The Emperor Hadrian restored the discipline of the Roman Army by setting the legions, some 350,000 strong, to work in the construction of public roads in northern Africa, France, Spain, and Asia Minor. The rapid spread of Christianity in the first and second centuries was largely due to the facilities for traveling in every portion of the then known civilized world. Flourishing cities were built, commerce was extended to subject peoples who became reconciled to the Roman Government, so much so that they became a homogeneous part of the empire. The remains of these roads exerted a very powerful influence in the defeat of the Germans in France, as the allied troops were transported over these good old roads constructed by the Romans in the days of their supremacy in that country.

In England the almost impassable condition of the roads of 200 years ago retarded the development of British industry,

and furnished the means of outlawry so ably depicted by English authors of a later day.

The fathers of the American Republic, in building the foundation for this Government, saw the necessity of good roads. Gen. Washington, who commanded the armies of the Republic, and in his early youth as a surveyor had gone over the western portions of Virginia, impressed with the necessity for a highway to the interior, advocated the construction of a national highway, now called the old Cumberland Road, which received the first appropriation in 1806 for its construction. It was an act approved by President Jefferson providing for laying out and making a road from Cumberland through the State of Maryland and the State of Ohio.

The bill made complete specifications as to the form of road to be constructed, and appropriated \$30,000 for the expense of laying out said road. President Jefferson had received the consent of the States of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia for laying out this much-desired road. By an act of Congress of April 21, 1806, authority was given to extend the road from a point near Cincinnati via Vincennes to St. Louis. From 1806 to 1844 Congress appropriated \$6,824,919.33 for this purpose and the road was used for a mail road.

So much had this subject impressed itself on the statesmen of the past that we find John C. Calhoun, who was the strictest constructionist of the Constitution, expressing his belief that the Federal Government should take a hand in building and improving highways, rivers, and canals, and introduced a bill to provide a fund for the construction of roads and canals, and while Secretary of War he made a report to the House in 1819 in which he said:

No object of the kind is more important and there is none to which State or individual capacity is more inadequate. It must be perfected by the General Government or not perfected at all.

Henry Clay advocated the building of national roads in a speech made in Congress in 1818.

Daniel Webster advocated the same proposition in 1830, in which he stated that he had arrived at the conclusion that the Government had power to accomplish this purpose.

President Jackson expressed himself in favor of public roads in a veto message in which he said that the "right of appropriation was not limited by the specified powers of the Constitution."

The Constitution itself vests Congress with the power in article 1, section 8, wherein it states—

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

This section of the Constitution has been growing in practical importance with reference to public roads. President Arthur, in a message vetoing the river and harbor bill in 1882, declared that post roads and public highways are highways of commerce as much as are railroads or rivers and harbors. They are the small arteries of our commercial body extending out into the country and gathering up and bringing into the market, the railroad station, and the wharf the raw products which are the real constituent elements of our commerce. They are equally indispensable to our commercial growth and welfare, and are equally deserving of the fostering care of our Government.

The late Senator Bankhead, of Alabama, a profound student of the post offices and post roads system of the United States, in a speech in the Senate on April 24, 1908, summed up the immense benefit to the industrial interests of the people at large in the building of public roads, and the absolute necessity of bringing the products of the farm to the city consumer and the manufacturing interests at reasonable cost, which he concluded could only be provided for by a system of good public roads. As the railroads opened the wilderness of the West to the American farmer and made possible the creation of the great Commonwealths beyond the Mississippi, by furnishing adequate facilities for transportation, so the public roads have multiplied the development of the wilderness into farms and cities.

The introduction of electricity has prepared a new and rapid method of travel and transportation of material on every highway and byway of the country that can be reached by a good road, and has emphasized the necessity of good roads, roads that can be used at all seasons of the year and under all conditions of weather.

The most recent object lesson for the absolute necessity of good roads has been the congestion on the railways in the transportation of materials throughout the country. In fact, in many of the cities people would have been reduced to dire want had it not been for the facilities for bringing in food supplies by truck over good roads. And with the development of the country it is now no longer a question that there should be an extension of the railroads to carry the material, but that the people themselves should be enabled to move their products

rapidly from the farm and village to the city, and at times convenient to them and at small cost.

The most powerful interest in public roads has been stimulated by the high prices of farm lands adjacent to public roads. Not that these farms became more productive, but by reason of the decreased cost and the certainty of getting heavy material to market. Where the farmer on the ordinary country dirt road is often delayed for weeks for lack of a passable condition over the road with an ordinary team, and often when passable can only haul from a thousand to twelve hundred pounds, with a two-horse team he can now, on the good roads which are being constructed, haul from twenty-five to thirty-five hundred pounds in half the time formerly occupied. The additional saving in the wear and tear on the vehicle, harness, and team also forms a considerable factor in the decreased cost in bringing his products to market.

In Bulletin 393 of the United States Bureau of Public Roads is found an economical survey showing actual increase in values of farm lands adjacent to good roads. The variation has wide limits, but on a careful study carried on by the Government a conservative estimate shows that all of the arable lands in the United States would be enhanced in value as a result of general road improvement by at least \$10 an acre. The total increase for the 1,140,000,000 acres of tillable land would amount to \$5,700,000,000. Add to this total \$1 to represent the increase in value of each acre of nontillable land, we have \$360,000,000 more, or a grand total of over \$6,000,000,000, a sufficient sum to build 300,000 miles of road on an average cost of \$20,000 per mile.

Now, as an actual fact within a few miles of this Capital City farm lands along the boulevard connecting Washington and Baltimore have increased in value since its construction and use from \$50 an acre to \$200 per acre, while equally good lands, and probably more productive, with equal improvements, more than a mile from the boulevard can be had at from \$50 to \$75 per acre.

It is an undisputed fact that as soon as a good road is finished and in use the value of farm lands doubles and frequently trebles in value.

In the past many enterprising communities constructed good roads for short distances and exacted toll, but these toll roads, while they were beneficial in a small degree to a few communities, became also a very serious burden to the traveling public and a heavy tax to the contiguous users.

There is a misconception as to the part the Federal Government plays in the construction of public roads. The act of July 11, 1916, the Bankhead bill, signed by President Wilson, provided an appropriation of \$75,000,000 for rural post routes, and made available at the rate of \$5,000,000 for 1917; \$10,000,000, for 1918; \$15,000,000, for 1919; \$20,000,000, for 1920; and \$25,000,000, for 1921. The basis of apportionment among the States is on the area and mileage of rural routes in the State. The Federal Government funds can be expended only for construction initiated by the State at 50 per cent of the value of roads and Government aid can not exceed \$20,000 per mile. There must also be a State highway commission in the State which participates in the fund. This requirement has been complied with by the States and has secured in the various States trained road engineers wherever the fund is expended and the supervision under them of the construction of the best durable available roads for the money expended. It has also secured the popular support among the people in the various States for road building by their appropriation of self-imposed taxation by popular vote wherever the subject has been thoroughly discussed and its advantages are known.

Up to 1915 the total expenditures for roads and bridges by the States and local governments in the United States are estimated at \$267,000,000.

It has been estimated that the fund available for the highway improvement program by the States and the United States for the year 1920 is in excess of \$600,000,000. This shows the great growth and increase in the popular demand for good roads and the confidence the people have in their highway departments, and the absolute necessity for securing good roads. Many projects have been submitted by States which the Secretary of Agriculture could not approve because of his doubt of their post-office status. The Secretary is now cooperating, through the Bureau of Public Roads, with the advisory committee of the American Association of State Highway Officials for the purpose of securing the greatest uniformity and greatest economical construction of these roads.

The Post Office appropriation bill of February 28, 1919, carried an additional appropriation of \$200,000,000 for the construction of Federal-aided roads, which is made available in installments of \$50,000,000 immediately; \$75,000,000 for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921.

From reliable sources it is now certain that a program which has definitely located roads, provided specifications for the system of construction and money appropriated for the same, will be completed in the course of the next six years at a cost of \$3,000,000,000. With the increasing interest now growing into enthusiasm throughout the entire country, it is safe to predict that this immense sum will even be doubled in the course of that period of time.

During the past year there have been built 55,550,000 square yards of concrete roads; 50,000,000 square yards of bituminous macadam, and 12,000,000 square yards of brick road. The cost is from twenty to twenty-eight thousand per mile for concrete, and thirty-five to forty-five thousand per mile for brick.

In the State of Louisiana the subject of good-roads construction was taken up by the people 10 years prior to the Federal aid act, and from that time a number of the parishes began the construction of improved highways, independent of Federal or State aid by special taxation voted by the people in their local road districts and parishes. Since that date there has been expended for roads under supervision of the State highway commission the following sums:

In the year 1916, \$323,983.30; in the year 1917, \$369,972.64; in the year 1918, even during the war, \$541,241.65; and in the year 1919, \$918,047.68.

There is now under contract at present projects which will cost \$5,172,411, making a total of \$7,325,756.27 expended for road construction.

There is now under construction in the State 505 miles under the control of the highway and Federal authorities. And in addition to this 505 miles, a number of parishes are building roads of first-class character, independent of State and Federal aid, State aid being extremely limited. The people have taxed themselves to build these roads by popular vote of the road districts or the parishes, and every taxpayer expresses his will for incurring the expenditure.

During the year 1919 there was voted by the various parishes and road districts in the State of Louisiana \$11,946,000 for highway construction. Add to this sum the Federal aid and the State aid with what is being constructed independently by the various parishes, it means the construction of 2,500 miles of good roads in the State.

The good-roads project for Louisiana embraces the building of 2,500 miles of first-class roads which will reach every parish in the State by various roads radiating from the city of New Orleans, the great metropolis of the Gulf.

The Jefferson highway, which has already been laid out from Winnipeg, Manitoba, through the States of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, will form the great midway continental highway of the United States, and will furnish a system of rapid transportation for travel and freight for this immense area of great production, and will lessen the cost and save time in bringing the products of the country to the ship side. A considerable portion of this highway is under construction in the various States between New Orleans and Manitoba. The State of Louisiana will build 410 miles of this highway in ample time to connect, and probably in advance of the complete construction from the Gulf to Manitoba. The Dixie highway and other great roads are in course of construction.

As an evidence of the determination of the people to have the best and most experienced engineers, it may be well to say in passing that the parish of Caddo alone, in the State of Louisiana, pays its highway engineer \$7,000 per annum, which is larger than the amount now being paid by the United States Government to its director of public roads.

In that particular parish road building began some eight years ago by the levying of a \$500,000 tax, which, after its expenditure, was supplemented by another vote of another \$500,000, and the parish is now expending another half million, and they have a complete, durable highway from the Arkansas State line from the north to the south end of the parish, 90 miles, this being on the eastern side. Another completed road runs 45 miles to the north, through the western portion of the parish, and one from the city of Shreveport to the Texas line, 22 miles, and another to the southeast toward the city of Mansfield, 48 miles distant.

The economy in transporting products of the oil country, its heavy machinery, and vast amount of material used in construction has paid a great profit on the investment to the public and enhanced the assessable values in the parish, so that the assessment has increased more than 300 per cent in the last five years, and not a murmur against the cost of this marvelous improvement.

The spirit for public-road building has become intense throughout the entire State. People along the banks of the Mississippi River, who are subject to disastrous floods from breaks in the levees, are convinced that the construction of good roads along the banks of the river means a better insurance against crevasses and overflows, by reason of the fact that a prompt shipment of material to the weak points in the levee where the danger of a break is probable will perhaps save millions of acres from the destructive waters of the mighty river, and the saving of the great crops of sugar, rice, and cotton is worth infinitely more than the comparatively insignificant cost of good-roads construction for a road to be used in case of an emergency.

For more than 30 years the people of Louisiana have cheerfully borne heavy taxes for the building of levees in order to save the appalling losses which from time to time have visited them and destroyed the fruits of the industry and thrift of the people to the value of enormous sums.

In addition to carrying on the ordinary expense of their State government in making great improvements in their public-school system by State and local taxation, the State, from April 20, 1918, to April 20, 1920, expended \$4,368,937.26 in the construction of levees.

The people of Louisiana are a great constructive people. They have been schooled by their long warfare with the greatest physical obstructions that ever confronted any people, but with many hearts they have grappled every great problem which faced them and have successfully achieved a victory which comes only to those who have the enduring virtues of a superior race. And now having been in the vanguard of good-roads construction they are determined to remain at the head of the procession in this absorbing work, which has become nation-wide, and which means to this great country development, prosperity, and security, which will remain and abide with the Nation until the end of time.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, at 4 o'clock the members of the Joint Commission on the Readjustment of Postal Salaries are to meet for the purpose of signing the report and agreeing upon a bill. It is very desirable that the report and the bill accompanying it be presented to the Senate to-day and properly referred; but before the report and the bill are brought to the Senate Chamber the Senate may have taken a recess or adjourned.

I desire, therefore, to ask unanimous consent that if meanwhile, before the report and the bill are presented, the Senate has adjourned or taken a recess, they may be filed and properly referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I desire also to ask unanimous consent that 5,000 additional copies of the report and 1,000 additional copies of the bill be printed for the use of the joint commission. I understand that that will come within the limit of the appropriation allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator asks unanimous consent that if the report comes into the Chamber after the Senate has adjourned or taken a recess—

Mr. STERLING. After adjournment or after a recess, it may be filed and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think anything like that has ever been done before, nor do I think we could do it.

Mr. STERLING. I understand that that course has already been taken in the House. They, anticipating the same situation in the House that may arise here, have asked for and obtained unanimous consent in the House, and I thought a similar course might be taken here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPARD in the chair). The Chair suggests that the Senator make his report now and hand it in later.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if this bill is the one that is referred to in the correspondence which all Senators are getting about readjustment of the salaries of postal employees?

Mr. STERLING. That evidently is the very bill.

Mr. KENYON. If we adjourn, there will be no opportunity to act on that bill at this session. I should like to ask the Senator if he feels, in view of that situation, that Congress should adjourn without adjusting the question of the salaries of postal employees?

Mr. STERLING. Hardly. My impression is that the bill will be disposed of during the present week. I believe that it will be. At any rate, that is the hope and the expectation of all the members of the joint commission.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? What is the additional amount of cost that will be devolved upon the Government by this bill?

Mr. STERLING. I can not tell the Senator just now what will be the additional cost. I may say, in a general way, that the increases perhaps will be disappointing to the employees and also, perhaps, disappointing to some of the officials of the Post Office Department. The commission has sought to find the safe middle ground between parsimony on the one side and extravagance on the other side in the salaries provided.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator know what 5,000 additional copies of the report will cost? I ask the question not because they should not be printed, and particularly if they are wanted, but because they must come within the \$200 limit by the action of the Senate.

Mr. STERLING. I do not know just what they will cost, save that I asked the printing clerk here on the floor awhile ago, and told him about how many pages I thought would be in the report, and he said he thought it would easily come within the limit allowed.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator, then, will modify his request so as to ask that there shall be 5,000 copies printed, or so many thereof as will come within the limit of cost of \$200, I have no objection.

Mr. STERLING. I modify the request accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request as modified is agreed to.

Mr. STERLING subsequently said: By direction of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries, authorized by section 3 of an act approved February 28, 1919, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, I submit the preliminary report on salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service with a view to the reclassification and readjustment of salaries on an equitable basis, accompanied by a bill, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The bill (S. 4475) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. STERLING. I ask that 1,000 additional copies of the bill be printed for the use of the joint commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand that there has been a unanimous-consent agreement entered into whereby we are to vote upon the Armenian resolution to-morrow at 4 o'clock. I observe nothing in that agreement which requires that we shall consider the resolution involved continuously until to-morrow. I do not know whether or not there is any Senator present who desires to speak on the subject now. If I thought there were I should not make the motion which I intend to make, but if there is no Senator now ready to speak on the resolution I wish to have the pension bill taken up.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOWNSEND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota and also of the Chair to the fact that there is pending a motion to proceed to the consideration of the magnesite tariff bill. Some discussion arose about the matter to which the Senator from North Dakota has referred, as to the parliamentary status of the Armenian resolution, and as to whether or not it could be laid aside upon motion. I made the motion, and it was succeeded by that discussion and by the address which has just been made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY]. If it is in order, I shall ask to have a vote upon the motion.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not understand how there could be a pending motion when we are discussing the other matter, which is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the regular order being Senate concurrent resolution No. 27, upon which it has been agreed to vote at 4 o'clock to-morrow, any motion to take up business at this time would displace that order and would be contrary to the spirit of the agreement. The Chair is of the opinion, however, that by unanimous consent the regular order could be temporarily laid aside and some other matter could be taken up.

Mr. McCUMBER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Could not the same end be accomplished by a motion to temporarily lay the unfinished business aside, the effect of which would be exactly the same, merely the temporary laying aside of the pending business, so that it may be brought up again at any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that that could not be done; that it would be a violation of the unanimous-consent agreement. If the Senator from North Dakota should ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business and to consider the measure he has in mind and it should be granted, then it would be in order to take up his bill.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will conform to the suggestion of the Chair and ask unanimous consent that the pending measure may be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of Calendar No. 528, being House bill 12530, which is the private omnibus pension bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the regular order be temporarily laid aside, and that the pension bill to which he refers may be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, before agreeing to the request, I should like to ask a question. What is the bill which the Senator from North Dakota desires to have taken up?

Mr. McCUMBER. It is the omnibus pension bill.

Mr. KENYON. Is it a matter which will take very much time?

Mr. McCUMBER. It will take a little time, I assume, because I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] objects to a number of the cases which are included in the bill; desires a vote upon some of them; and wishes further to discuss others.

I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa, however, that many of the items which are included in the amended omnibus bill are items which have been on the calendar since last September. We have not passed any of them during the winter or up to the present time, holding them all in abeyance until the Fuller bill should be passed, and then eliminating from the total number of cases before the Senate all that would be taken care of by the Fuller pension bill.

Mr. KENYON. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but a motion has been filed to reconsider the minimum wage bill, which was passed on Monday last, and I am anxious that that motion shall be disposed of.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope that we shall be able to consider the matter referred to by the Senator, and that there will be no objection to taking up the pension bill at this time, unless some Senator may desire to speak at the present time upon the pending measure. In that event I should not, of course, urge the consideration of the pension bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall not object to the request of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to proceed with the consideration of the pension bill. By that I do not mean to say that I assent to the passage of the bill, and I am speaking now merely for the purpose of combating a statement made by the Senator, or at least the inference to be deduced therefrom, that the Senator from Utah objected to some of the claims contained in the bill for which the Senator from North Dakota asks consideration. I object to substantially all of the items of appropriation in that bill, carrying 600 or 700 private pension claims. I shall not ask for a vote, as I stated to the Senator the other day, upon all of the items, but only upon two or three groups, and I shall probably desire to discuss, not each item—for if I should undertake to do that it would take several days—but some of the items in each group, and to call the attention of the Senate to them. It will probably take some little time, however, to discuss the various items to which I desire to call attention.

If the Senator will pardon me, however, I should like the Senator to yield, if he will, to enable the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], if he desires, to call up for immediate consideration and passage the bill to which he called the attention of the Senate a few days ago and to which I then objected. I objected to the consideration of the measure because it was entirely new, I was not familiar with its terms, and, as I gathered from him, the bill contained provisions different from what upon an examination of the bill I found were contained in it. After examining the measure, I desire to say that I think it is meritorious, and I shall be glad to do anything I can to aid the Senator from Washington in securing its consideration and passage. I will add that I do not refer to the magnesite bill, but to the bill for the relief of soldiers enlisted for service in Siberia.

Mr. McCUMBER. If there is no objection to doing so, the bill to which the Senator from Utah refers may be taken up at any time, but I should like at least to call up the bill to which I refer and get the legislation started in order that the Senator may present his objections. I think he told me the other day he would probably take half an hour in discussing the matter; but I should like to have the bill considered and disposed of, if possible, for it covers a great many cases and

many of the individuals who are affected by it are in indigent circumstances and are very old and feeble. I think we ought to put the bill through at this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota a question. The cases included in the bill of which he is in charge are not covered, as I understand, by the general pension bill recently passed.

Mr. McCUMBER. They are cases that would not be covered by the general pension legislation; they are cases of an extreme and necessitous character.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. What is the total carried by the bill for the special cases?

Mr. McCUMBER. The total appropriation, I think, will amount to about \$148,000, provided the recipients of the benefits under the bill live a year.

Mr. WARREN. Some of them have died while the bill has been pending.

Mr. McCUMBER. But experience indicates that probably half of them will pass away during the year; and the added expense to the Government would really be nothing, because, taking the number of deaths of beneficiaries of special bills in a single year, the amount saved is very much more than the amount that has ever been granted in any year under special pension acts.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Am I correct in my impression that a great many of the special cases which were heretofore on the calendar were taken care of under the general pension bill recently enacted by Congress?

Mr. McCUMBER. Three-fourths of them were taken care of in that legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall make no objection, but I hope the Senator will follow it up by calling for the consideration of the bill which is designed to pension some of the regular soldiers and officers.

Mr. McCUMBER. I certainly intend to do so.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12530) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to take this occasion, since I do not know when I may have another opportunity, to call the attention of the Senate to a condition existing throughout the country of which I am sure the Members of this body are not fully appreciative.

The so-called high cost of living has had such an effect upon the people of this country that I am sure they have not properly analyzed just what are its causes, and, not having the conditions of the problem clearly defined in their minds, they are not prepared to apply the proper solution.

It is needless for me to refer to the unprecedented influx of gold into this country, antedating our entrance into the war but immediately subsequent to the outbreak of the World War. We were in a position at that time to furnish in larger measure than any other nation, perhaps, the great necessities of the world to meet the conflict that was then raging. It was not so much a question of the price that these articles would cost as a question of getting the articles; so that the resources of the nations involved in this conflict were strained to their utmost and gold poured into America in exchange for the things that were essential to the prosecution of the war.

That there was profiteering at the expense of our European friends goes without saying. When it was known that it was a question of getting the material rather than the price of the material, when the issues of life and death, nationally speaking, were at stake, no time was left for bargaining. It was simply a question of time and not a question of cost. The consequence was that an unfortunate condition was precipitated by circumstances over which it seemed that no one had control. Labor was to be enticed to enter into the production of these things wanted abroad.

Fabulous prices, as compared with the wages they had previously received, were offered. Every vocation and avocation that employed manual labor was stripped to the bone, and these great war enterprises were fostered in order to supply the needs of those in dire distress abroad.

This went on for more than two years, prices mounting because the things that were needed for war were the basis of the things needed in the ordinary commercial pursuits in this country. Then, when we entered the war the same necessity gripped us, because the war in Europe had gone on for so long

a time that those who were our allies were bled white, and when we entered the war it was only a question of time and not a question of expense. The consequence was that we entered under the same conditions that Europe had found herself, and prices mounted and mounted, and the very basis of living in this country was jeopardized, because from forest and field and factory were drafted those who were supplying the necessities of life to the population of this country and put into the production of those things that were essential to meet the crisis impending in Europe. It is true that under the new banking and currency law every pound of available wealth, every yard, every system of measuring wealth in this country, was met adequately by our flexible system of banking and currency, so that the whole wealth of this country was mobilized under these high prices in order to carry on the war.

Now, Mr. President, the war is past. Prices for the necessities of life have risen from two prime causes—one, the unprecedented demand for labor at these exorbitant prices and the other the consequent scarcity of the necessities of life, caused both by the season and by the drafting of the producers into the war.

Here we are now; the armistice has been declared and the high cost of living is still at its peak. Profiteering has been charged, and doubtless has gone on, but it has been more universal than those who speak of profiteering have cared to define or have defined. From the bootblack on the street corner to the most intricate form of manufacture things have risen *pari passu*, so that it is a question of a higher plane of prices universally. It did not happen just in a minute, because when the demand was made for labor, and the wage of the laborer rose, the thing that the laborer produced rose, and the consequence was that that which he produced in every department went up comparatively with it, so that the purchasing power of the dollar, as has been said, was cut half in two, and the shoe black who had been living on his nickel a shine found that he either had to charge a dime or go on half rations, and he charged the dime. The man who has been working for \$100 a month and buying a \$50 suit found that when he went with his \$100 he had to do without a suit, and he must of necessity get more for his time; and, outside of a few salaried men, there was a relative rise, so that in the division of the circulating wealth that we had there was no very exceptional condition. The multimillionaire and those that were farthest removed from him just had their relative positions changed in the mounting prices.

Now, the war is over. The armistice has been declared. There is no crisis confronting us, no urgent demand for the production of anything, save one thing, and that is the bread and meat of this country. We have sufficient of manufactures to tide us over the period of reconstruction. Men can patch their old suits and patch their old shoes and make them do another day or another year, but they can not patch their breakfast and dinner and make them do for the morrow; and the cry of this country now is for the necessities of human food.

What is the condition that now confronts us? Our banking people, the Federal reserve people, seem to think that at this time it is incumbent upon them—and it doubtless is—to join in this great warfare against high prices. Now, every man in this country knows that when everything is said and done the development of this country and its prosperity depend fundamentally upon credit, and credit depends entirely upon the system by which the credit is granted and sustained. Therefore, whoever has charge of the management and the manipulation of the currency of this country has charge of its development and prosperity.

We were all proud of the fact that we had passed a law that met the stupendous strain of a World War, that financed America without impeding its progress and development domestically, that financed Europe, and during the period of that war the failures of the national banks of this country rapidly decreased until in 1919, when our banking system was put to the severest test to which a banking system could be put, there was not a single national bank failure in America involving a dollar's loss to a depositor. In addition to that, the Federal Reserve System during this period not only gradually decreased the number of bank failures, but it was the basis upon which the bank resources of this country have increased an average of over 600 per cent.

In addition to that, not only had they increased 600 per cent, but the Federal Reserve System itself, according to the best information I can get, made 108 per cent profit.

As I said, we are confronted with a condition unparalleled in the history of this country, so far as bread and meat are concerned. I interrogated the Secretary of Agriculture to know what was the supply of labor this year as compared with

last year, and his reply to me was that it was 72 per cent of normal, numerically speaking, but as to its efficiency it was impossible to tell, in that those who were left to produce the agricultural products of this country were largely women and children and old men.

Of course, young, vigorous men, who heretofore have tilled the farms, are not going to stay on the farms under the conditions which now confront us. Why should they? They, like some of us, have mistaken plenty of money for wealth, and the possibility of obtaining with ease the necessities of life. But we are rapidly approaching the place where we will find out that wealth counted in gold and silver and in circulating money does not mean bread and meat, or the other necessities of life.

Young, vigorous men, with scarcely any training at all, in the towns and villages and cities of this country, can command six and seven and eight and nine dollars a day, working eight hours a day, and is it to be thought that any man, governed by common sense, is going to forego that and go to a farm where the highest return is scarcely half that, if half, and then, when he has labored from 12 to 14 hours a day at half the pay he could get elsewhere, depend upon the other man for the price of the thing he produces? Is it any wonder that our farms are left tenantless, that our fields are left uncultivated, by the thrifty, the young, the enterprising, when eight hours a day and from six to eight dollars a day is beckoning to him?

Which one of us here to-day, charged with the duty of legislating when necessary, and providing means when necessary to avert a calamity which is impending, or if we have not the legislative power, agreeing to call attention to it—which one of us would advise a young man to-day to go and engage in agricultural pursuits, at \$2.50 or \$3 a day, or, if he is running it on his own responsibility, to incur now an indebtedness for high-priced implements to work his farm, for high-priced fertilizer to fertilize his farm, for high-priced labor to aid in cultivating his farm, and then have to wait six long months before he gets a commercial asset to meet the liabilities, then to take the proceeds, after the investment of his money in these high-priced articles, and put them on the market at the say-so of the other man? The consequence is that our agricultural labor is absolutely decimated.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator is discussing a very practical question, and he puts his finger on the trouble, in my opinion—that it can not be expected that agricultural products will reduce in price, or even stay where they are, if men in other lines of employment are paid double and treble what the worker on the farm is paid. Yet, if the job on the farm is made attractive enough to induce people to abandon the industries in which they are paid three or four times what they are paid on the farm, how can the owner of the farm, and the employer of farm labor at those trebled prices, hope to reduce the price of his product?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is the very point I am coming to now.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand. I have simply amplified a little the subject the Senator was discussing. I am waiting in anxious anticipation, and I know I can greatly profit by listening to the Senator's remedy for this condition.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly the remedy is not the one which is being applied now. I said in an interview which I gave out to the press several months ago that I knew that if the patriotism of certain individuals could be appealed to—which I knew was idle to ask—if those engaged in nonessential manufacture or production, those who are engaged in the manufacture of things which are not absolutely essential, could be induced to desist, and if they could not, then if our banking and currency law were of such a form—and after reading and studying it, it seemed to me that it was in a manner amenable to that construction—there should be a restriction of accommodation to such enterprises.

But in applying what they consider the power they have, they have absolutely intensified the condition under which we are now laboring.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator is now, I presume, referring to the order of the Federal Reserve Board increasing the discount rate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; that is what I am coming to now.

Mr. NORRIS. I am laboring still under the impression that under section 4 of the Federal reserve act the Federal Reserve Board had it within their power to issue an order which would go down and even reach the member bank, to discriminate in the kinds of credit it could extend. For instance, it could say to a member bank, "You will not be entitled to rediscount your paper here if you are extending credit to speculators. It is

your duty to extend credit," let us say, "to those who are producing food, and your duty to refuse credit, or at least any additional credit, and draw down a little of what you have extended to those who are engaging in nonessential business and who want the money for nonessential things." Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. If they have that power, then it seems to me that if they would exercise it, to a great extent it would remedy the condition, would it not?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That was my impression.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, I would like to relate an actual interview I had with a farmer on this very point. A man whom I have known for nearly 20 years, who was operating quite a large farm, engaged in the raising of wheat and corn and hogs and cattle, in a locality where it is necessary to use a great deal of fertilizer, came into my office a few weeks ago and was talking about the situation, and about this order of the Federal Reserve Board.

He told me that several weeks ago he went to his bank and tried to borrow \$500 for the purpose of buying fertilizer, which the Senator will realize is one of the things the farmers have to do now, and they have to wait until their crop is marketed before they pay for it.

It is a credit which is very common at this time of the year where they use fertilizer, and it is very desirable for the good of the whole country that it should be extended. Notwithstanding the fact that the banker said the farmer was good, and I know personally that he was perfectly good, they declined to allow him anything, and told him that on account of the Federal reserve efforts to curtail loans and draw in and contract in all directions they could not let him have anything.

He was a little suspicious of it, felt that it was not quite right; he wanted to try it out and test the program. So he drove around to an automobile dealer in the same town, whom he knew very well and who knew him very well, and he said to the automobile man, "My automobile is getting old and I ought to get a new automobile. I would like to talk with you about it."

The automobile man said, "All right." He showed him an automobile, looked his old machine over, and told him how much he would allow him for it. Then the farmer said to him, "Well, I have not got the cash. I will have to wait until I harvest my crop in reality, so that I would have to buy it on time." The automobile man said, "That is all right. Your note is perfectly good. Give me your note and take out the new machine."

Then he said to the dealer, "Do you do that with everybody?" He said, "I do that with everybody who is good. I recognize that your note is good, and I do that with anyone whose note is as good as yours." The farmer said, "Are you able to carry all of us who want new automobiles?"

He said, "Oh, no; I could not carry any of you, but I will take your note to the bank as soon as I get it and get cash on it."

Of course, in reality the farmer did not want to buy an automobile, and he left the dealer; but he concluded, and it seems to me he reached the logical conclusion, that in some way, somewhere, this was worked so that if a man wanted to borrow money for the purpose of increasing production and helping to decrease the cost of living he could not get it, but if he wanted to buy something which was manufactured and handled and owned by a business man, if he wanted to buy a new automobile for a joy ride, he could get all the money he wanted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, every man here knows that the most timid thing in the world is money, and everybody knows that when the Federal Reserve Board sent out notice that the banks must retrench they knew who would have to retrench. When they were required to reduce their line of credit, everything moving along the line of least resistance, whose line of credit would they first reduce?

Mr. NORRIS. Now, let me interrupt the Senator further with this illustration. Is there any doubt, in the judgment of the Senator, that under the law as it stands now they could have issued an order so that the banker would have run the risk of not being able to get any credit if he loaned to the man who wanted to buy an automobile, but would have no difficulty whatever in rediscounting his paper if he loaned to a man who wanted to buy fertilizer?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think not, Mr. President. The fact of the business is this, that in the attempt to lower the cost of living they have done two things, one to raise the rate of interest, so as to make borrowing as unenticing as

possible; and the other is to absolutely refuse loans, as they say, on certain characters of business.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I might recite an experience I myself had the other day with a loan in New York, which does not altogether substantiate the fact that this is the only class of loans which are being denied.

I will say to the Senator that I indorsed the note of a certain business man—a thing which I do not do very often—for \$56,000. The other day the note fell due, and there was no extension on any part of it. It had to be paid that day, no matter what sacrifices might have to be made, and it was paid. These calls of loans are not only made in the case of the farmer, but every business man in the United States is suffering from the calling of loans now. When you see advertisements in the papers of a cut of from 25 to 33½ per cent in prices in order to induce the purchase of merchandise, you may put it down immediately that it is because loans held by the merchants have been called by the banks. There is an extension of credit beyond what they claim they ought to give.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The purpose for which I call the attention of the Senate to this matter is that it does seem to me that this body of men do not clearly differentiate between artificial production and natural production. The artificial producer is a manufacturer. He has control of his seasons, he has control of his output. At the end of every 12 or 24 hours he has a commercial asset to meet his commercial liabilities in producing that asset. If danger threatens his business, he can instantly begin to retrench; he can gauge the crop he is going to produce to the pound or the yard, and the quality of it, and he can control the price of it; while the natural producer, the man who furnishes your table and mine with the bread and meat that we eat, must assume for six months liabilities that he is morally and legally bound to meet and then depend upon conditions outside of himself and beyond his control as to the quality and the quantity of the thing that he produces. In addition to that he has no voice in the price of the product.

So that in the spring, when he has contracted for all his high-priced fertilizer, all his high-priced implements to cultivate his farm, when he has contracted for his high-priced labor to help cultivate it, he has assumed a liability that he must meet, while over the assets that he produces he has no control with reference either to quantity or quality or price.

Now, in this day of readjustment, in the spring of 1920, the farmers of this country are called upon to produce foodstuffs to meet the fearful shortage not only in America but in the world. What is happening right now? I have a letter in my pocket that I wish to read, which will give some intimation as to the condition of affairs. It is from one of the best farmers in my State. I read:

MY DEAR SENATOR: You are probably familiar with the action of the Federal Reserve Board in shutting off loans and refusing to rediscount paper for the national banks. This situation will prove quite embarrassing to farmers and others as well who are depending on the banks for money to buy supplies and pay for labor. Our labor is already short and demanding high wages, and we can not hope to hold them unless we are able to pay them promptly for their work. If there is any way for us to get around the present emergency, I would thank you to suggest it, as I know quite a good many farmers who are greatly embarrassed by the present situation.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KING. If I understand the letter which the Senator has just read, the complaint seems to be that the Federal Reserve Board, if it has not discriminated in the discounting of paper, at least has refused to encourage the making of loans to farmers and has refused to take farmers' paper when transmitted by the member bank making the loan upon that paper.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think in order to be fair to the Federal reserve bank—

Mr. KING. I wish to know if that is being done.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I think it is not. The Federal reserve bank in its zeal to deflate—and if I had the time this afternoon I should like to discuss the misnomer of what we call inflation—in order to bring about deflation and in order to lower the cost of living, is desirous that the productive elements in the country shall receive all the assistance that they can while the nonessentials and nonproductive industries shall be curtailed. But when they send out a blanket request that the banks of the country shall retrench and shall lessen their lines of credit, the banks are going to use their discretion, and it is not likely if Mr. A. is engaged in a non-

essential production and has vast wealth and vast resources and has kept a big balance in the bank from year to year that he is going to be called upon to remove his note in this emergency, while the farmer who has no resources save the little crop that he may have on hand or the prospect of making one will be the first man to feel this tightening of credit.

It is for that reason that I am making this plea. A banker down in my State who is required to retrench necessarily looks around to see where he can do it with the greatest amount of thrift to himself, and the consequence is that he eliminates those lines of credit that to him are not gilt-edged and better for him as a banker.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. When would the Senator have the deflation begin? To what time would he postpone it?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would not postpone deflation at all, but I would certainly have an absolute unmistakable utterance from the Federal Reserve Board and some practical method suggested by them by which deflation would be taken along lines that would not jeopardize the fullest production of the necessities of life in this country. I think they are like Paul said about the Jews. I think they use the zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. They ought to have some plan and put into operation some plan that would absolutely be practicable in retrenching along lines that would not reflect disastrously in the matter of production.

Mr. McCORMICK. Precisely. I am agreed with the Senator. Along what line would he have them proceed?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. They seem to have the power under section 4 and under an amendment which was placed on the Federal reserve law some six weeks or two months ago. I think the Senator will recall the amendment. I intended to have something to say about that amendment, how in its very workings, if applied to any considerable section, it would result disastrously on notes, drafts, or bills issued for agricultural purposes, because right now in the spring, when farmers want to pay off in cash—and you can not get your help on credit, but Saturday night you must pay, and you must meet your cash payments for fertilizers and implements, and you must discount your notes in order to get that cash—what is going to be the result if, in this general deflation, the bank says, "Our line of credit is exhausted and we are called upon to retrench, and we can not accommodate you." Then what about production in this country?

Mr. McCORMICK. Do I understand the Senator, then, to agree that the Reserve Board should exercise its influence to induce a restriction of credits now employed in the production of things not necessary to the life of the country and its people?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do; and then get a practical rule by which, in trying to do that, they do not destroy the essential production of the country.

Mr. McCORMICK. Then, does not the Senator believe that the conference held by the Reserve Board some two weeks ago ought to have been held some three months ago, in order to mobilize the credits to move the crops this year?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to state that the thing that alarms me now is this. My attention was called to this illustration, as it was an actual case in hand:

A merchant in a little village, my home, had contracted for supplies for the farmers. The tobacco crop will soon be moving. He wanted to lay in a supply against the harvesting and sale of the tobacco crop. He went to the bank to get his note discounted to meet the payments, the 30 or 60 day discounts, and he could not get a penny. The farmers were diversifying, under the advice of the Agricultural Department, in order to meet the ravages of the boll weevil in the planting of tobacco. Here is this merchant prepared to help them in food and in sustaining their needs in the way of extending credit, but when he goes to the bank he can not get a penny. Why?

It was because the psychological effect of this move to restrict panics is sweeping the country, and the most timid thing in commercial life is the cash, and when there is the least danger of its power being restricted it seeks cover. The Federal Reserve Board should see to it that there is issued not only a request, but they should work out some plan by which the banks of the country will be encouraged to lend as liberally as possible to the producers of the country at the lowest possible rate of interest.

The men upon whom we are depending to feed and clothe the country are the men who know the least about banking and have the least credit. Unless we give them to understand now in the spring of 1920 that the high cost of the fertilizer

which they buy, the high cost of wages that they have paid, the high cost of the implements that they have to buy will be taken care of as nearly as can be by the banks extending them loans, we need not be surprised if the farmer retrenches and says, "I will only plant so much as will take care of me and mine." He is a human being.

What kind of a business man would you call him if in this springtime he were to buy all that is necessary in order to produce his crop and compete in the market for labor to gather that crop, and then under this impulse and drive of the banking institutions of the country to drive things down he would know that in the fall, when he goes to capitalize his assets to repay for these things bought at the peak, that he may be left, as he has heretofore been left, with the privilege of going back and making another crop without any profit?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I was talking with a banker some weeks ago, and he stated that credit was being denied to agriculturists where it ought to be extended, and he insisted that the agriculturists of the United States had been so prosperous that ninety-nine out of every hundred of them needed no loans from banks in order to finance their operations or to aid them in planting or removing their crops. I should like to ask the Senator, because he is familiar with agricultural conditions in the United States, as much, perhaps, as any man in the Senate, whether or not that condition described by that banker is correct?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No.

Mr. KING. Or whether or not their condition is such that they need credit now and need money from the banks in order to carry on their usual spring operations?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Why, that answers itself. There may be here and there one or two who have sufficient to take care of themselves, but the great rank and file of the farmers to-day feel like they are rich because they have been able to pay themselves one time out of debt, but they have nothing ahead.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to this fact: There goes out an order from the bank that we must retrench in all lines, and a merchant is called and he has to meet his 30 or 60 day paper and therefore can not get the discount. What does he do?

Every Senator here knows that practically all other business outside of agriculture is organized—perhaps not all but the bulk of it is organized. So whenever a merchant loses on a bill of goods he charges that loss on to the next bill, and thus recoups himself. Whenever you raise the interest to 7 per cent, when a merchant has been paying 5 per cent, he charges the extra 2 per cent on the shirt which he sells you and the shoes which he sells me. If there comes a loss to him by virtue of some one stealing something from him, he has the privilege of distributing it here and there over his goods, and so recoups himself for the loss. From what can the farmer recoup when he incurs a loss? It is impossible and impracticable for him, particularly so far as the great staple crops of the country are concerned, to fix the price of the product which he sells. If he could do so, I should not be on the floor of the Senate this afternoon pleading for the people who feed and clothe this country. They have no power to control the prices of that which we eat and that which we wear, which they produce.

When a bank raises the rate of interest, when the manipulator of the prices of his product puts those prices down, where does he recoup? He recoups by taking his children out of school, and thereby increasing the illiteracy of the country; he recoups by taking the conveniences out of his home and foregoing those things which make civilized life pleasant and happy; he recoups by taking up the burden of poverty and ignorance, and going back once again to mother earth to produce more bread and more meat, more food for the people.

The time is coming—I hope and trust that it is here now—when the agriculturists of this country shall demand a square deal in this important matter. When the rate of interest is raised, do you suppose the merchant is going to lose anything by it? How long would he stay in business if he did? Do you suppose the banker is going to lose anything by it? How long would he be in the banking business if he did so? Do you suppose the wholesaler, the retailer, or the jobber is going to lose one penny by it? They each charge it up in the price of the article which they have to sell, in the shape of money or merchandise, while the producer of the raw material is the man from whom it is ultimately extracted. Hence to-day, with every vocation and avocation save agriculture overrun with labor and paying labor fabulous prices, the farmer is unable to secure labor with which to cultivate the fields of America,

although upon his activity and industry our prosperity depends.

Mr. President, I am standing here this afternoon to say that the last amendment which we passed to the banking and currency law giving the Federal Reserve Board the power to restrict the amount of paper which a member bank may discount to a percentage of the capital and surplus of that bank, and when that percentage is exhausted then to gradually increase the rate of interest, will operate, as it is now operating, to restrict the necessary credit and capital necessary to the industrial and agricultural centers of the country, and, in my opinion, will work a disaster that can not be calculated.

Under the law as heretofore administered a member bank was not restricted to its capital and surplus, but if it accepted a certain kind of paper it could accommodate those who were developing agriculture and the necessary industries almost without limit. Now, under the amendment of the law every bank can, with the approval of the board, be restricted, so far as credits are concerned, to an amount equal to its capital and surplus, and when it has gone beyond that be subjected to a progressive and graduated tax that may make a loan prohibitive.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. KING. It is some time since I looked at the figures which show the number of State banks and private institutions that are in operation and the number of banks that belong to the Federal Reserve System, but my recollection is that the number of banks connected with the Federal Reserve System greatly exceed all other banks and organizations engaged in the loaning of money. What I want to ask the Senator from South Carolina is whether or not the action of the Federal Reserve Board in restricting loans, particularly as their action affects the agricultural interests, will not lead to an increase in the number of State banks?

Furthermore, I should like to ask the Senator whether or not, in view of the action of the Federal Reserve Board, State banks are not attempting more and more to care for their agricultural customers? Does the Senator know to what extent State banks are caring for such customers and whether or not their resources enable them to meet, or substantially to meet, the imperative needs of the agriculturists of the United States?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will state, Mr. President, that if the policy which is being at present pursued by the Federal Reserve Board were to continue, I think it would mean the decimation of the system; that the member banks would withdraw from the system, because the enticement heretofore which has called such banks into the Federal Reserve System, in my opinion, has been the privilege of almost unlimited credit, or at least credit limited to the general resources of the entire system and not to the particular member bank. If their borrowing capacity and their banking capacity are going to be limited to their capital and surplus, what inducement is there for them to enter the system? Why should they not stay out of it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it not also true, certainly in the South, that in the rural sections the State banks are not large banks?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And that they depend, in great measure, upon the national banks of the cities to loan them money; so when you cut off the supply of the large national banks of the cities you have taken away from the small State banks their power of making loans?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Furthermore this is true: Many such banks before the inauguration of the present Federal banking and currency system had associations with banks in New York City and other large centers from which they borrowed, but since the inauguration of this system they have borrowed from the national banks in their own principal cities; they have given up their arrangements with the eastern centers, and are not borrowing there; and now this cutting off of the national banks throughout the country, especially outside of the great centers, will take away from the banks in the rural sections almost their entire opportunity of obtaining credit and advancing the necessary funds to their rural constituents.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. One of the characteristic differences, one that is fundamental and should be maintained between the present system and the old system, is the decentralizing and liberalizing of loans and credits. Under the old system

the commerce of the country was largely dependent upon the impulse and caprice of a few leading bankers in one great city. Whenever they saw fit to extend a loan it could be extended; at what rate of interest was left to their sweet will. Under the Federal reserve law we attempted and succeeded in getting an impartial body of men who had no interest save the development of the resources of the Nation along safe lines, and gave them the power to determine what should be the character of the paper that should be hypothecated for the issuance of Federal reserve notes. The country responded in a manner that is startling.

I have here in my desk a report from the Comptroller of the Currency, which shows that within the seven years of the operation of the Federal reserve banks the banking resources of the national banks of the South increased 900 per cent, their resources having increased \$590,000,000 more than they increased from 1863 to 1913. The banking resources of the national banks on the western coast within the seven-year period increased 1,300 per cent, while the resources of the New England banks increased 108 per cent, those of the Northern States 300 per cent, and those of the Middle West 300 per cent, proving conclusively to the student of economics that under the old inflexible banking and currency system the great cities of the North and East, having the capital of this country in their hands and selling money, had exhausted the resources of the other sections, so that when money was decentralized, the basis of credit changed, and the actual wealth of the country and not bonds and gold became the basis of a circulating medium, those sections whose development had been arrested by virtue of the lack of a flexible system responded marvelously to the new impulse.

The South with her enormous resources, but with no capital by which she could put them into operation, responded nine times over; the far West, new, undeveloped, and liberated from the thralldom of the money kings, responded to the extent of 1,300 per cent; but in the eastern section, where they had bartered and sold the lifeblood of the United States, the banking resources only responded to the extent of 108 per cent; proving that this very system has developed this country beyond the dreams of those who framed it.

Now, when the test is on, when the country is crying for bread and for meat, when the fields are being left fallow, is it wisdom on our part so to administer the law as to put us practically in the same position as we were under the old law of 1863 and put into the hands of a few men the power to say to one, "come," and he cometh, and to another, "go," and he goeth; and to one section of the country "prosper," and allow another section to dwindle and die for the want of the life-giving blood of money?

I am pleading here to-day for that class of people who can not influence the banking jugglers except by the soup house and the free kitchen, and, by the help of God, they will influence them; their time is coming.

Mr. KING and Mr. McCUMBER addressed the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator from North Dakota desire to ask a question?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Admitting everything the Senator has said to be true, what on earth has that got to do with the case of—

Laura A. Moorhead, widow of Samuel Moorhead, late of Seventh Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would rather pension the poor devil that is out on the farm, making bread and meat for the American people to eat at this time, than to pension some one who happens to be the beneficiary of a soldier.

Mr. McCUMBER. So would I; but I think we would do more for him if we would get through with the bill that is before the Senate at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I just want to state to the Senator that, in my opinion, this is a matter of such prime importance that I felt that I should be derelict in my duty if I sat silent when I heard and read these appeals for help that are being made every day. There is no legislation that I know of that we can pass; but we can at least let the country know that we do appreciate the cry for help of those upon whose shoulders rests the feeding and the clothing of this great country, and we ought to serve notice on the bankers of this country that we demand that every legitimate credit shall be extended to those who produce the agricultural products of this country, so as to enable them to maintain a price that will educate their children, put carpets on their floors and

pictures on their walls, and let them know that the country that eats their food at least appreciates the source from which its bread and meat come. That is the plea I am making.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator whether or not, in his opinion, in the administration of the law, the Federal Reserve Board would have the right to discriminate in favor of a section or a class where the material welfare of such section or such class is inseparably bound up with the welfare and prosperity of the entire people; or is the rule so ironclad and so inflexible that they must place every victim upon the same bed, Procrustean in character, and cut him off if he is too long or lengthen him if he is too short? What is their discretionary power with a view to advancing the real and substantial welfare of the people and of the country?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is unlimited. The bill to which I refer, and especially the last amendment that was passed, to which I objected and still object, gives them the power to fix the normal rate, as they call it, so low that when they progress and graduate the tax from time to time, before it became prohibitive, the bank would have borrowed maybe two or three times its capital and surplus; but I am informed that in some States, in one State in particular, they have fixed the normal rate at the usury rate in that State, so that, if that be true, they can not discount a dollar's worth of paper.

Mr. President, I want there to be no misunderstanding of the position I have taken this afternoon. To sum it up, I believe that the producers of the necessities of life in this country should be given to understand by the Government now, as far as it can do it in accordance with the genius of our Government, and by the bankers and financiers of this country, that they will be protected in every legitimate way so as to insure their receiving a profitable return for that sine qua non, the bread and meat of this country and the clothes of this country, and that though retrenchment and deflation may be necessary, that retrenchment and deflation shall be along those lines that will help the producer rather than hurt him; that the line of cleavage shall be clearly made between the essential and the nonessential, and that the most important fact should not be lost sight of that he, having incurred obligations at the very height of the market, shall be given the privilege of disposing of this crop at a price that will at least give him a reasonable profit.

The producer has no place upon which to charge off his loss and recoup himself. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] asked me if he went into the market and competed and paid these high prices, and he was protected in getting a profit on them, when might we ever hope for the prices to come down? I answer him that the present crop has already been pitched upon the peak of high prices, and, so far as the raw material is concerned, the American people may not and should not expect any reduction in the cost of the raw material produced this year; but if the proper care is taken when another spring comes on and another crop is projected, then, with the lowering of the price of those things that the producer must have, he can lower *pari passu* the things that he produces under those conditions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I know that the Senator did not intend to misquote me, but I think he drew a wrong inference from what I said some time ago. What I asked was, if agricultural labor on the farm was increased in its wage so as to make the position attractive as against that of the city laborer, who was paid three times as much, how a reduction in agricultural prices would ever come about?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is a different proposition. Of course it could never come under those conditions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not intend to criticize the Senator at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I understand thoroughly, because I think the Senator from Connecticut, together with all other Senators in this Chamber, realizes the peculiar disadvantage at which the producers of the raw materials—the farmers—are at this particular time. The putting out of a general statement that we must curtail our loans without emphasizing and putting into operation a rule by which that curtailment shall not affect production is affecting it. It is affecting it disastrously.

Farmers are to-day wondering what is to become of them, having incurred this vast volume of debt, if the banks refuse credit and they are not enabled to distribute their production over a period of time which will enable them to get the best market price, but must be forced to put their stuff on the market to meet the obligations incurred in producing it. Any rational man who has a family to support will not take any such chance.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator what ought to be done in order to meet an exigency such as that to which I will call his attention?

I received this morning a telegram from some of the wool-growers of the West. As the Senator knows, they have produced their wool crop, to use his expression, at the peak of high prices. Labor has been high. All of the products and commodities utilized in the production of the wool have been exceedingly high. They have been compelled to borrow to carry their sheep over and to carry on their business during the winter months until they realized from the sale of their wool and the sale of their lambs in the spring.

The banks now are denying them credit, or at least they are curtailing the credit to such an extent that they are greatly embarrassed, and the wool buyers in the East decline to make advances, because they contend that their capacity to borrow is restricted. The result of it is that these woolen men—and the same applies to the cattlemen—are going to meet with serious financial losses unless something is done immediately to ameliorate the condition and to afford them relief. Can the Senator suggest some policy to be pursued by the Government or by the banks which will prevent this great catastrophe which threatens to overwhelm an industry so important to the development and the prosperity of the country?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I think that the cattle growers and the wheat growers should be given to understand now that no such condition as the Senator has described would be tolerated a minute, and that the credit subtracted from a nonessential would be immediately placed at their disposal, to give them encouragement to go on with the production of meat and clothing for this country.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. President, I believe that the Federal Reserve System is trying to do its part to bring about a normal condition. As I heard one illustrate it, if you want to lower a house you can put jackscrews under it and let it go down gradually and in a proper manner, and you still have your house when you have it lowered. But if you attempt to lower it from the top with a sledge hammer you can lower it all right, but when you get it lowered you have not any house.

You are not going to deflate the currency in any radical manner or by the autocratic will of any set of men. You have to deflate the currency as the law of supply and demand and the delicate adjustment of commerce indicates you can do it safely. A false principle wrought into our life is going to work itself out in disaster, and no wholesale order from any man or set of men can do other than jeopardize the welfare of this country or plunge us into a panic. I am pleading for those who are going to be the first affected, those whose failure will first affect us.

In conclusion, I repeat, that we may not be mistaken, we should not mistake a plethora of money for a plethora of wealth. The two are as widely different as a gold dollar is from a biscuit. When there are plenty of biscuits you can buy them with a gold dollar, but you can not, when you have not any biscuits, eat the gold dollar.

So that wisdom would teach us to make just as much of the necessities of life with the agency of the dollar as possible, so that it will be as it is intended to be, a simple representative of wealth, and not make the mistake of considering that it is wealth.

Mr. President, I have said about all I care to say this afternoon on this question. I want the financial interests of this country to give the producers of the country to understand that in the midst of this, the most wonderful financial prosperity this country has ever seen, those who produce the necessities of life shall be amply taken care of and be given priority in every loan which is essential for their welfare.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The Reading Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Keyes	Phelan	Sutherland
Brandeggee	McCumber	Phipps	Thomas
Chamberlain	McNary	Sheppard	Underwood
Dial	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Wadsworth
Edge	New	Smith, Md.	
Gerry	Norris	Smith, S. C.	
Kenyon	Page	Smoot	

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] on official business.

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Louisiana

[Mr. RANDELL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. LENROOT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts answered to their names when called.

Mr. CALDER, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. KING, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. SHIELDS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. KENYON. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. COLT, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. HARRISON, and Mr. MCKELLAR entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present. The Secretary will continue the reading of the amendment reported from the Committee on Pensions.

The reading of the amendment was continued to line 18, page 74.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if I may have the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I wish to submit at the proper stage one or two motions to amend the amendment and to strike out certain items. I do not want it to be considered that by waiting until the conclusion of the reading of the amendment I have waived the offering of those amendments so that I shall have to move a reconsideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator can safely allow the reading to go on until we get through and then have a vote on one or more items, as he desires.

Mr. KING. I do not wish unnecessarily to delay the reading.

Mr. McCUMBER. Personally, I will consent to that.

Mr. KING. I have no objection that the reading may be concluded.

The reading of the amendment was concluded, it being, on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

The name of John J. Kraft, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Patrick Collins, late of Company A, Fifty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Sutor, late of Company I, First Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Van Denbergh, widow of Jacob Van Denbergh, late of Company D, One hundred and twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William A. Wilson, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy J. Clark, widow of Thomas J. Clark, late of Company K, One hundred and eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Jane McMahon, widow of Matthew McMahon, late of Company D, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Zora Hockman, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron Hockman, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William D. Dennison, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Callie B. Boatright, widow of John T. Boatright, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of George T. Baldwin, helpless and dependent son of William L. Baldwin, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Phebe E. C. Priestley, late an Army nurse, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Warren, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Ferdinand Lambert, helpless and dependent son of Andrew Lambert, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, payable to a duly appointed guardian or conservator.

The name of Catharine Macaughay, helpless and dependent daughter of James Macaughay, late of Company G, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Smith, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia R. Osgood, former widow of Joseph Rudler, late of Company G, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Jesse A. Smith, helpless and dependent son of William Smith, late of Company F, Phelps Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George W. Hollenbank, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Slack, widow of Magnus D. Slack, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Harrod, late of Battery C, Kentucky Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eva McNett, former widow of Jacob B. McNett, late assistant surgeon, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Samuel Bainter, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie J. Page, widow of George W. Page, late of independent company, Dennison Guard, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Thomas J. O'Harra, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Seventeenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Leedom, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Middleton, late of Company B, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Acton, former widow of John Quinn, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda B. Birch, widow of J. J. C. Birch, late acting medical cadet, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Wilson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Horine, widow of George M. Horine, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Bertha Blanch Welmer, helpless and dependent daughter of John S. Welmer, late of Company F, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James Robison, late of Company B, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ezra Shanks, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sibra Armstrong, former widow of James M. Lawrence, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David Hahn, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice West, helpless and dependent daughter of Sylvester D. West, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Stephen H. Leonard, late of Company A, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Max J. Alwens, late of Company E, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Colbert Ratliff, late of Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond Harvey, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Bates, widow of George Bates, late of Company H, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Joseph R. Lawson, late of Company J, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Lake, former widow of Joshua W. Lake, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George W. Willard, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johanna Dowling, former widow of Owen Garvey, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John Garvey, helpless and dependent son of said Owen Garvey, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Johanna Dowling the name of said John Garvey shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Johanna Dowling.

The name of Emma Park, helpless and dependent daughter of James A. Park, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George Milton Frye, late of Company E, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isabella Gruver, widow of James A. Gruver, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Elizabeth I. E. Duffield, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas A. Duffield, late of Company B, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ellen Bridge, former widow of Franklin Hart, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Drake, former widow of John Herrington, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth S. Van Pelt, former widow of Gaines Brock, late of Company G, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Lillian S. Dodds, widow of James Dodds, late second Lieutenant of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Rhode Island Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Ritter, widow of Austin Ritter, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Levi Welch, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lazarus W. Johnson, late of Company K, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Tuttle, widow of Henry G. Tuttle, late of Company E, Forty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Pease, widow of Dallas M. Pease, late of Company A, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Emily N. Wellman, widow of Norman Wellman, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Benjamin Jackson, late of Company B, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Mawhiney, widow of William I. Mawhiney, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John H. Mawhiney, helpless and dependent son of said William I. Mawhiney, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Louisa Mawhiney, the name of said John H. Mawhiney shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Louisa Mawhiney.

The name of Emma L. Lindsay, widow of David A. Lindsay, alias James D. Hamel, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Zachariah Allbaugh, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriett Jordan, widow of Lindsey Jordan, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Cora B. Kelley, widow of James Kelley, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Julia A. Marugg, widow of Simon Marugg, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adella Mae Lee, widow of James E. Lee, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Maggie Dona Lloyd, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph Lloyd, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Israel Boyer, alias George Johnson, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Oscar W. Miller, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Miller, late of Company A, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Frank Haight, helpless and dependent son of Frederick G. Haight, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Smith, late of Company H, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Bowman, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Bowman, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jessie G. Gilman, helpless and dependent daughter of Elbridge P. Gilman, late of Troop G, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of William H. Sumption, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Virginia Zachary, widow of John Zachary, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Samuel Pryor, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane M. Henderson, widow of Henry W. Henderson, late of Company I, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Joseph Buckle, late of Company E, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adolphus Sterling, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Boyd, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Felix R. Robertson, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene Cunningham, helpless and dependent son of Moses S. Cunningham, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Plank, widow of George W. Plank, late of Company C, Webster County Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Emaline C. Lindner, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Lindner, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jason Johnson, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment, and Company D, First Regiment, Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Ash, late of Company A, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frances E. Parmater, former widow of John J. Parmater, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lillian Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis A. Brown, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George Wilson, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James F. Smith, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Ford, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David E. Mosholder, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Broyles, helpless and dependent son of Henry Broyles, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Sixth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Maurer, former widow of Isalah Miller, late of Company G, Seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Catherine Weber, former widow of Robert R. Martin, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Diana Lucas, former widow of Nathan Lucas, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Solomon J. Grine, late of Company C, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Garstang, late of Company D, Fremont Body Guard, Missouri Volunteer Mounted Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Charles S. Humphrey, late of Company F, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy E. Taylor, widow of Thomas G. Taylor, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Murray V. Livingstone, late of Company D, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Beach, helpless and dependent daughter of Willard O. Beach, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Phillips, former widow of Orren W. Stanford, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Callie Oberer, widow of John Oberer, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Sarah Cain, widow of James Cain, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of James Cain, helpless and dependent son of James Cain, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah Cain, the name of said James Cain shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah Cain.

The name of Helena Garges, helpless and dependent daughter of Amandes Garges, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Horn, late of Company K, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy H. Jacklin, former widow of William Jones, late of Company G, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William E. Cheek, late of Company F, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Ervin, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Herrell, late of Company M, Eleventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah M. Fitger, late of band, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lottie Baughman, widow of Isalah Baughman, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Emma E. Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas Brown, late of Company H, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Loretta Hosey, helpless and dependent daughter of James R. Hosey, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James R. Hann, late of Company I, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucian Smith, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Brantner, widow of James S. Brantner, late of Company B, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda Button, widow of James W. Button, late of Company G, Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William Cline, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha L. Elliott, widow of Salathiel Elliott pensioned as Salathiel Ellet, late of Company E, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Sarah Mowry, former widow of Jasper Lanham, late of Company M, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Emma Swalls, helpless and dependent daughter of Eli Swalls, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Zetta Swalls, helpless and dependent daughter of Eli Swalls, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jasper Stoops, late of Company H, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Parks, widow of Jasper N. Parks, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary Haremaker, widow of Peter Haremaker, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Nelson Behymer, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel C. Nicolson, late of Company D, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Burton Walters, helpless and dependent son of Borda Walters, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fannie E. Porter, widow of Daniel P. Porter, late of Company D, Third Battalion Rifles, Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles S. Porter, helpless and dependent son of said Daniel P. Porter, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Fannie E. Porter, the name of said Charles S. Porter shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Fannie E. Porter.

The name of Jane Burton, former widow of Maurice Burton, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary A. McGill, helpless and dependent daughter of James McGill, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Eben N. Higley, late a coal heaver, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. James, widow of Leander M. James, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Helen James, helpless and dependent daughter of said Leander M. James, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha J. James, the name of said Helen James shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha J. James.

The name of Betsey Palmer Mason, former widow of William H. Palmer, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Merritt A. White, late of Companies H and K, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Flack, late of Company D, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert W. Gibbs, late of Company E, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Coddington, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher Wilson, late of Company A, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel J. White, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca E. Brown, former widow of James M. M. Houston, late of Company L, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James T. Jones, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriett A. Lake, widow of Dewitt C. Lake, late of Company F, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Thomas W. Sample, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Murray Ringland, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Lafferty, late of Company K, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Sexton, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac Sexton, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John W. Mercer, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Wolf, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustav Hamberger, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Scholl, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Hanson, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin E. Warren, helpless and dependent son of Edwin A. Warren, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company K, Seventeenth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Peter P. Fallor, late of Company K, Forty-seventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robison D. Maus, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie L. Lewis, widow of Joseph Lewis, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Robert Niven, late of Companies M and H, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, to include \$10 per month special pension under medal of honor roll.

The name of Salathiel K. Wise, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Leroy, widow of Fred, alias Frederick, Leroy, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Louisa Engelhardt, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Engelhardt, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Joseph S. Hall, late of Company B, Fifty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Keltner, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Asa Clark, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Spencer, late of Company H, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dora Myers, former widow of Charles Swodes, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Samuel Shelline, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Libby, late of Company B, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Davis, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther Bedel, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment, and Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Flavius J. Cole, late of Company B, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David M. Haskell, late of Company A, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Webster Cotton, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Flora Heath, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel A. Heath, late of Company C, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Reiber, late of Company C, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah N. Bolinger, widow of Jacob N. Bolinger, late watchman United States ram *Fulton*, Mississippi Marine Brigade, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thompson S. Lozaw, helpless and dependent son of Samuel Lozaw, late of Company D, Fourth Independent Battery New Jersey Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph J. Dalbey, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louise H. Thornton, widow of William H. Thornton, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Peter T. McQuain, late of Company B, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Whitson, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel K. Rowe, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Waller, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Kate McLaughlin, an Army nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Wade, former widow of John Cales, late of Company A, One hundred and eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Nancy C. Troupe, former widow of James L. Forgey, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Enoch K. Shackelford, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment, and Company L, Eighth Regiment, Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Shellhorn, late of Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Burgess, widow of George T. Burgess, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, and it is also directed that the widow be paid the soldier's accrued pension.

The name of Alexander Kimbrough, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Garret H. Fowler, late of Company K, Sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick A. Hart, late of Company D, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Crow, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment, Company H, Fourth Regiment, and Company C, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cassie R. Hatch, helpless and dependent daughter of Albion L. Hatch, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William A. Karnes, late of Company E, Garrison Guards, and private, unassigned, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Frost, widow of Charles L. Frost, late of Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nelson B. Hackett, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry H. Rowe, late of Company H, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline St. Denis, widow of Gideon St. Denis, late of Companies I and A, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josiah C. Hancock, helpless and dependent son of Francis M. Hancock, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Wroton, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles M. Taylor, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Ruth Bartlett, helpless and dependent daughter of Sylvanus Bartlett, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jesse W. Rigby, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jerome B. Summers, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Werner, widow of Adam Werner, late of Capt. Knapp's company, Seventh Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Charles M. Bingham, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company M, Thirteenth Regi-

ment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Gibbs, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Cobb, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza C. Ludwig, widow of Frank Ludwig, late of Company D, Third Battalion New York Volunteer Artillery; Company D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry; and Company F, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Lafayette Van Gundy, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Frazier, late of Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sadie C. Steadman, former widow of Hezekiah N. Steadman, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hunter C. Frampton, late of Company F, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, no deduction or rebate to be made on account of former alleged overpayment or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Helen B. Owen, widow of Robert S. Owen, late of Company A, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William D. Moores, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William O. Callis, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Bolen, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Corn, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion Cahall, late of Company B, Thirty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reuben Boring, late of Company C, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Barnes, widow of Leander P. Barnes, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James Doran, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment, and Company D, Thirty-ninth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry; Company A, Third Battalion, and Company F, First Battalion, Eleventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip A. Warner, late of Company K, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Pond, widow of Chandler H. Pond, late of the Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Martha Williams, widow of Joseph T. Williams, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bowen, widow of George L. Bowen, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Elizabeth M. Sager, widow of Garrett S. Sager, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John W. McPherron, jr., late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Tinney, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan H. Orr, widow of Charles W. Orr, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Hugo Schrotky, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eva J. Plante, former widow of Louis Peipker, late of Sixth Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Loretta McKee, helpless and dependent daughter of Amos McKee, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rosella Magee, helpless and dependent daughter of James Magee, late of Company I, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sallie A. Cox, widow of William Cox, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Foster, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment, and Company G, Sixtieth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward R. Roll, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and Company B, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Sillman, widow of John F. Sillman, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura Levenseler, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Levenseler, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment

Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William W. Goodridge, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Henry, late of Company K, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Christy, widow of Thomas J. Christy, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Keys, widow of William T. Keys, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James Bartram, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Totten, widow of David R. Totten, late of Company G, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Edgington, late of Company K, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gurney E. Hall, helpless and dependent son of Elijah P. Hall, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. Pearl, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Burney, former widow of James M. Chapman, late of Company F, Seventy-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Robert Gilmore, late of Company C, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Thomas, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lyman M. Sherwood, late of the United States Marines, United States ship *Saranac*, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Walker, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Wroten, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas S. Ward, late unassigned, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriette Skelton, widow of Samuel G. Skelton, late of Company A, First Regiment Alabama Vidette Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William H. Willey, late of Company B, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Coogle, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellis Henthorn, late of Company K, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy J. Sheldon, widow of Charles M. Sheldon, late of Company K, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Philander S. Groesbeck, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marsh Smith, late of Company F, One hundred and fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catharine Lenz, widow of Solomon Lenz, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles H. Lenz, helpless and dependent son of said Solomon Lenz, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Lenz, the name of said Charles H. Lenz shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Lenz.

The name of Solomon Morris, late of Capt. Eaton's Company, Departmental Corps, Monongahela, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of James L. Moore, late of Company A, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gilbert Smith, late of Company B, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet H. Carmical, widow of John Carmical, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim A. Adams, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment, and Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan Bedell, helpless and dependent daughter of David E. Bedell, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George H. Pennington, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment, and Company K, Ninety-first Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa R. Bechtel, widow of Morgan S. Bechtel, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Joseph Guffy, late of Company A, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Johnston, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alida A. Marshall, widow of Joseph N. Marshall, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$65 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of James E. Marshall, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph N. Marshall, \$20 of the additional pension granted herein shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Armidred Marshall, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph N. Marshall, \$20 of the additional pension granted herein shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Alida A. Marshall, the names of James E. Marshall and Armidred Marshall shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month to each of them from and after the death of said Alida A. Marshall.

The name of Eliza McDanel, widow of John McDanel, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Laona Carver, widow of Andrew J. Carver, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie L. Ramsdell, widow of Andrew S. Ramsdell, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia E. Mills, widow of Leonidas E. Mills, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Michael Kirby, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna Sheridan, widow of John Sheridan, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William Francis Sheridan, helpless and dependent son of said John Sheridan, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Anna Sheridan, the name of said William Francis Sheridan shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Anna Sheridan.

The name of Andrew J. Hale, late of Company I, Fiftieth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abigail Merriman, widow of Henry L. Merriman, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James B. Erskine, late of Company B, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmar K. Coppock, helpless and dependent son of Calvin Coppock, late of Company C, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara C. McCracken, widow of John M. McCracken, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. McCracken, helpless and dependent daughter of said John M. McCracken, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Clara C. McCracken, the name of said Mary A. McCracken shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$24 per month from and after the date of death of said Clara C. McCracken.

The name of Elecia Rexroad, widow of Maranda H. Rexroad, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna F. Willis, helpless and dependent daughter of Alfred Willis, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Woods, widow of David Woods, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Robert H. Kernan, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Thompson, helpless and dependent son of Andrew G. Thompson, late of Company B, Forty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Bothwell, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Firkins, late of Company D, Fifty-third Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and forty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of George Guilford, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Dines, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isalah G. Mayo, late of United States Sanitary Commission's ship *S. E. Browne*, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida McCoy, widow of James McCoy, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Sophia Schram, widow of John Schram, late of Companies H and B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and

pay her a pension at the rate of \$27 per month: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Estella L. Schram, minor daughter of said John Schram, \$2 of the pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sophia Schram the name of said Estella L. Schram shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 and \$2 per month from and after the date of death of said Sophia Schram, until she attains the age of 16 years.

The name of Ellen S. Vestile, widow of George W. Vestile, late of Capt. Bassett's Independent company, Ninth Regiment Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Mary A. Shepherd, widow of William A. Shepherd, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$45 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William E. Shepherd, helpless and dependent son of said William A. Shepherd, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Shepherd, the name of said William E. Shepherd shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Shepherd.

The name of Susanna A. Johnson, widow of Eugene W. Johnson, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elexious H. Conly, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Hopkins, widow of Calvin Hopkins, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva Whittlebery, helpless and dependent daughter of William E. Whittlebery, late of Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward H. Bennett, helpless and dependent son of Lewis Bennett, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alwilda Wheeler, widow of George H. Wheeler, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Nientzenhelzer, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Edwards, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Durham, helpless and dependent son of Tolford Durham, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

And insert:

The name of Margaret Yohe, widow of Adam Yohe, late of Company C, Second Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles Francis Schaeffer, helpless and dependent son of Daniel W. Schaeffer, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Juliann Fyock, widow of David Fyock, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary Fyock, helpless and dependent daughter of said David Fyock, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Juliann Fyock, the name of said Mary Fyock shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Juliann Fyock.

The name of Addie L. Hubbard, former widow of Abijah L. Hubbard, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment, and Company C, Second Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ann Brooks, former widow of Garrett Gordon, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Seebers, late unassigned, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Nason B. Cunningham, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Caroline Delbert, widow of Jacob Delbert, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella Thatcher, widow of John W. Thatcher, late of Company H, Twenty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ann E. McGrew, widow of William T. McGrew, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth G. Young, former widow of William H. Green, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane Cory, helpless and dependent child of Charles Cory, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Lovell, widow of Lewis Anderson, late of Company C, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Queen, widow of Thomas Queen, late of Company B, Eightieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John Queen, helpless and dependent son of said Thomas Queen, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And pro-*

vided further, That in the event of the death of Elizabeth A. Queen, the name of the said John Queen shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Elizabeth A. Queen.

The name of John I. Amy, late of unassigned Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Donahue, widow of Philip Donahue, late of Company F, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lenora Stewart, widow of Joseph H. Stewart, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Fry, widow of William Fry, late of Company I, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Oscar Fry, helpless and dependent son of said William Fry, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Fry, the name of said Oscar Fry shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Fry.

The name of Pauline Sanders, former widow of George W. Johnson, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Richard Martin, helpless and dependent child of Jackson Martin, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edwin Fiske Bassett, helpless and dependent child of Edwin F. Bassett, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Moses, widow of Alonzo Moses, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Wilcox, widow of Andrew Wilcox, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hanna D. Jelison, widow of George W. Jelison, late of Company K, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Casler, widow of Henry R. Casler, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Greer, widow of William H. H. Greer, late of Company K, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Helen F. Wade, widow of Silas Wade, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia Shaw, widow of John Shaw, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Abbie H. Lewis, widow of Henry A. Lewis, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Sixty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances Watches, widow of Allen Watches, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Miller, widow of Ira Miller, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Horace M. Miller, helpless and dependent son of said Ira Miller, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Miller, the name of said Horace M. Miller shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary Miller, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

The name of Nancy M. Davis, former widow of George Davis, late of Company H, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Dellah Hunley, widow of Archibald Hunley, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Josephine Brown, invalid and dependent daughter of William Brown, late of Company C, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie A. Stephens, former widow of Ivan D. Stephens, late of Company I, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen G. Frame, widow of John O. Frame, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca H. Whiteacre, widow of William Whiteacre, late of Company B, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret E. Melson, widow of John E. Melson, late of Company D, Purnell's Legion, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John D. Sullivan, late of Company C, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, without deduction or rebate for former alleged overpayments.

The name of Bridget Lillis, former widow of John McKeever, late of Company E, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Myrtle I. Arnold, widow of Addison C. Arnold, late of Company B, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie B. Duer, widow of John O. Duer, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma J. DeYoe Bassett, former widow of Newton W. DeYoe, late of Company E, Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Pier, widow of John W. Pier, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Fourteenth Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Blanche Bunker, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron E. Bunker, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of John W. Walker, helpless and dependent child of Otis Walker, late of Company C, One hundred and Sixty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Linda Whetsel, widow of Solomon Whetsel, late of Twelfth Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Bowen, widow of Russell Bowen, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William Francis, helpless and dependent child of Abraham Francis, late of Companies F and G, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Gass, helpless and dependent son of Andrew J. Gass, late of Company D, Sixty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rita Shafges, former widow of Jacob D. Schilling, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda J. Reynolds, former widow of Albert A. Gates, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie S. Marsh, widow of Samuel W. Marsh, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Second Regiment New York Mounted Volunteer Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy A. Lawther, widow of James T. Lawther, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isabel Burge, widow of Jacob W. Burge, late of Company P, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malissie Sands, widow of Jesse Sands, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Agnes Anderson, widow of James Anderson, late of Company C, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Carrie Abbott, former widow of William Watson, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Matilda Laswell, former widow of Samuel C. Dale, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, without further deductions on account of former erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Jennie Schofield, former widow of Milton S. Hammond, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isabella Kelley, widow of John Kelley, late of Company G, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary G. Leary, helpless and dependent daughter of Michael H. Leary, late of Company H, Thirty-second Regiment, and Company B, Ninth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Caroline Greenwold, widow of John Greenwold, late of Twelfth Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia Kemper, widow of Herman Kemper, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James W. Ledford, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, without further deductions on account of former erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Miriam C. Hone, helpless and dependent daughter of James Hone, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Abram Brannum, helpless son of Silas Brannum or Brennam, late of Company I, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Murphy, former widow of Henry Bisbo, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lilla J. Darling, helpless and dependent child of Nelson Darling, late unassigned, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James E. McKenna, helpless and dependent son of James McKenna, late of Company G, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Flint, former widow of Thomas Fitzgerald, late of Companies I and C, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie Myers, widow of George Myers, late of Company D, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ione D. Bradley, widow of Luther P. Bradley, late brigadier general United States Volunteers and brigadier general United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza M. Martin, former widow of Samuel W. Davis, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month.

The name of Julia W. Nichols, widow of Henry Nichols, late of Company C, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances Langguth, widow of John W. Langguth, late of Companies B and A, Seventeenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Kate C. Kralg, widow of John C. Kralg, late of Company A, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Christie Fish, widow of Austin C. Fish, alias Clark A. Fish, late of Companies K and C, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna S. Christopherson, helpless and dependent daughter of Ole Christopherson, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Bell, widow of John T. Bell, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles H. Bell, helpless and dependent son of said Mary E. Bell, the additional pension granted herein shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Bell, the name of said Charles H. Bell shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary E. Bell, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

The name of Martha C. Igo, widow of Daniel Igo, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment, and Company I, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mabel Igo, helpless and dependent daughter of said Daniel Igo, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha C. Igo, the name of said Mabel Igo shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha C. Igo, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

The name of George W. Heator, helpless and dependent son of Joseph Heator, late of Company E, Twenty-seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Moorhead, widow of Samuel Moorhead, late of Seventh Battery New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ida A. Moorhead, helpless and dependent daughter of said Samuel Moorhead, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Laura A. Moorhead, the name of said Ida A. Moorhead shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Laura A. Moorhead, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

The name of Harriet M. Godfrey, widow of Edwin J. Godfrey, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Melissa E. Dickinson, widow of Solomon A. Dickinson, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Osborn, helpless and dependent daughter of Andrew J. Osborn, late of Company G, Second Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ella D. Madden, helpless and dependent daughter of Hosea F. Madden, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kathrina Balthasar, former widow of Frederick Helmholt, late of Company K, Forty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Elkins, widow of Joseph Elkins, late of Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie M. Kimball, widow of Andrew J. Kimball, late of Companies A and B, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret L. Wilson, helpless child of William C. Wilson, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah J. White, widow of William W. White, late of Company K, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Minnie E. White and Alice O. White, helpless and dependent daughters of said William W. White, or in the event of the death of either of them, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah J. White, the names of said Minnie E. White and Alice O. White shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month each from and after the date of death of said Sarah J. White, to continue during the period of helplessness and dependency.

The name of Antoinette Flint, widow of Henry J. Flint, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Olive M. Kelly, widow of George Kelly, late of Company C, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice Swinford, former widow of John Swinford, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Watson, widow of George M. Watson, alias Martin W. Moore, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Missouri State Militia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda C. Deal, helpless child of Henry Deal, late of Company B, Seventy-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret A. Williams, former widow of William I. Dunfee, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Walsh, helpless child of Michael J. Walsh, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margrett Mabery, widow of William Mabery, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fred Hawk, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Jinkins, helpless child of William Jinkins, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary Ann Ellis, former widow of Lewis Ellis, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cora Mitchell, widow of Levi Mitchell, late of Company A, Fifty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Katherine Hallbaugh, former widow of John Detrick, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Mackin, widow of William A. Mackin, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Gibson, widow of John H. Gibson, late of Company G, Thirty-seventh Regiment, and Company E, Fifty-fifth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary T. Barnard, widow of John Barnard, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Sullivan, widow of Cornelius Sullivan, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna E. Middleton, helpless child of James Middleton, late of Company H, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Myra E. Chapman, widow of William H. Chapman, late acting third lieutenant, United States revenue cutter *Joe Lane*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth A. Burke, widow of Michael Burke, late of Company H, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and Two hundred and forty-sixth Company, First Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Angeline Latty, widow of John Latty, late of Company C, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Strome, former widow of Alfred Hunter, late of Company C, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Surface, widow of Flavius S. T. Surface, late of Company G, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$6 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Flavius S. T. Surface until she reaches the age of 16 years: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Maude L. Surface, helpless child of said Flavius S. T. Surface, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah A. Surface, the name of said Maude L. Surface shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah A. Surface.

The name of Fidelia A. Boyd, former widow of Volney Baker, late of Company C, Thirty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of David Rushton, enrolled as David Rushton, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George Bowen, late of Second Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Shaffer, former widow of George W. Bennett, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Flora B. McCain, widow of Thomas J. McCain, late of Company L, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Cleveland, former widow of George A. Hull, late of Company C, First Battalion, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet L. Cobb, former widow of Jedekiah Crocker, late of Company F, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Gress, widow of Adam Gress, late of Company H, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rhoda A. Hunnewell, widow of John B. Hunnewell, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Meda E. Dodge, widow of Asa S. Dodge, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Benefiel, widow of Hiram A. Benefiel, late of Company C, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charles Waide, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel T. H. Williams, helpless child of John Williams, late of Company G, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Cooper, widow of James B. Cooper, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sabina Wade, former widow of William G. Hutton, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Jane Griffin, helpless child of George Griffin, late of Company K, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belle Grisamore, former widow of Lewis C. Good, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adella M. Whitcomb, widow of Charles B. Whitcomb, late of Company C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Lyons, widow of John Lyons, late of Companies H and A, Seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosanna Miller, helpless child of Joseph Miller, late of Company I, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia M. Ferry, former widow of David E. Ferry, late of Company D, Fifth Battalion, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Holmes, former widow of John O. Holmes, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Michael Fogarty, helpless child of Patrick Fogarty, late of Company G, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Byerly, helpless child of Benjamin Byerly, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lillian M. Evans, widow of William W. Evans, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eva Shaw, widow of John J. Shaw, late captain and commissary of subsistence, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Morrow, widow of William W. Morrow, late of Company C, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Weddel, helpless child of William P. Weddel, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma Bridgett, widow of Sylvanus Bridgett, late of Company D, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and \$6 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Sylvanus Bridgett until he reaches the age of 16 years, all such pension to be in lieu of that now being paid under minor's certificate No. 720162, on account of soldier's minor child.

The name of Louisa T. Dillen, widow of Charles M. Dillen, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Verna Hammore, helpless child of David Hammore, late of Company G, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca J. Kohn, former widow of Obadiah Larimer, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William Jones, helpless child of Uriah Jones, late of Company F, Fifty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Homer Hoover, helpless child of James Hoover, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grace M. Bacon, widow of Americus V. Bacon, late of Company B, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and Company F, Eighth Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet S. Parker, widow of Charles Parker, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah C. Wilson, widow of John Wilson, late of Company M, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa Jane Holmes, widow of Alfred D. Holmes, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Ann Gettings, helpless child of Nelson Gettings, late of Company K, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda J. Smith, helpless child of James T. Smith, late of Company A, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Nancy A. E. Shanklin, widow of John S. Shanklin, late of Company I, Ninety-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sibba Miller, helpless child of Brice Miller, late of Company H, Third Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Varner, helpless child of Newton J. Varner, late of Company K, Eighteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna E. Hudson, widow of Minor Hudson, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Gideon C. Lewis, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan M. Drake, widow of Charles B. Drake, late of Company B, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lillie C. Marvin, former widow of Edward O. Crossman, late of Company E, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Joseph Ford, late of Company G, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Louisiana Thompson, widow of Cyrus B. Thompson, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Daisy Manore, helpless dependent daughter of Frank Manore, late of Company D, Ninety-fifth and Forty-seventh Regiments Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, payable only to a legally appointed guardian during period of incompetency.

The name of Ann Bullard, former widow of Adam Jack, late of Company F, Twenty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Marjorie A. Baker, widow of Seldon C. Baker, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jennie Lego, widow of John William Lego, alias William Lago, late of Companies L and E, Fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Martin, widow of Andrew Martin, late of Company A, Eighty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sophia A. Lint, widow of Conrad Lint, late of Company H, Eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Efner, widow of Henry Efner, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza Murphy, former widow of Timothy Sullivan, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and fortieth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Smith, former widow of Samuel Jones, late of Company B, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Boone, widow of John Boone, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Ann Fuller, widow of Wilber W. Fuller, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth F. Humbert, widow of Joseph D. Humbert, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Bessie M. Trenor, widow of Henry H. Trenor, late first lieutenant of Companies E and F, First Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emily Robinson, former widow of George P. Thornton, late of Company F, First Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda Burlett, widow of Joseph A. Burlett, late of Company B, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie Hills, widow of Francis M. Hills, late of Company M, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Mexico, and lieutenant colonel Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sherman G. Johnson, helpless and dependent son of Simon P. Johnson, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Sutherland, former widow of George W. Speelman, late of Company H, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rhoda A. Beatty, widow of Samuel T. Beatty, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Pennsylvania Emergency Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susarah Cooper, widow of Jesse Cooper, alias William Harris, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Marinda E. Hays, former widow of John W. Sabin, late of Company B, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lula V. Wainwright, former widow of William T. H. Wainwright, late of Company G, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and \$6 per month additional on account of the minor child of said William T. H. Wainwright until she reaches the age of 16 years, all such pension to be in lieu of that now being paid under minor's certificate No. 723210 on account of the soldier's minor child.

The name of Sebra Colrider, widow of William L. Colrider, late of Battery E, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia S. Dunn, former widow of George W. Graham, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia Agnes Held, widow of Charles W. Held, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adelia E. Lindsey, widow of Joseph W. Lindsey, late first lieutenant of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer

Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George S. Holbrook, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca B. Tooley, widow of Patrick H. Tooley, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and Company G, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca J. Kaylor, widow of Samuel F. Kaylor, alias Samuel Furry, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, McLaughlin's squadron Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza C. Spears, widow of Simon Spears, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen Goodbrand, former widow of Charles Myers, late of Company G, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice McDowell, widow of Charles McDowell, late of Company M, Fifteenth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy Bennett, widow of James Bennett, late of Company G, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel W. Hayden, late private, Sixth Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emma A. Briles, former widow of George E. Hubbard, late second lieutenant of Company E, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary S. Frame, former widow of James A. Wyant, late of Company E, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza L. Sprague, widow of Wellington G. Sprague, late major United States Army (retired), also corporal Company A, First Wisconsin Heavy Artillery, captain Company H, United States Colored Infantry, second lieutenant Sixteenth United States Infantry and Thirty-fourth United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Julia A. Loyd, widow of Milton Loyd, late of Company K, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa E. Prickett, widow of William W. Prickett, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma Call, helpless and dependent daughter of Cyrus T. Call, late of Company K, One hundredth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary C. Donley, widow of Levi Donley, late of Company B, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Atala F. Allen, widow of James A. Allen, late of Company I, Ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minna Bechtold, former widow of Frederick Dorr, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment, and Company G, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lillie May Fifield, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Fifield, late of Company D, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edna May Williamson, helpless and dependent daughter of Horace Williamson, late of Seventh Independent Battery Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary M. Hancock, former widow of Granville S. Hancock, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Harding, former widow of Laban N. Harding, alias Newton Hardin, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Davis, widow of Wilson H. Davis, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of William Buckwheat, jr., helpless and dependent son of Benona Sarazin, alias William Buckwheat, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charlotte I. Mallory, widow of John A. Mallory, late of Company B, Third Battalion, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company A, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Lake, widow of Joseph S. Lake, late of Company F, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia A. Crum, widow of Amos Crum, late second lieutenant of Guthrie's unattached Company A, Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances M. Venable, widow of George F. Venable, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia M. Bowles, widow of Justus C. Bowles, late of Company K, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Morand, widow of Alfred L. S. Morand, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cornelia F. Huckins, former widow of Jeremiah J. Hathaway, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Matilda M. Whitaker, widow of Robert D. Whitaker, late of Company A, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Azubath Srofe, widow of John U. Srofe, late first lieutenant Company E, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret J. Cramp, widow of William N. Cramp, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie F. Titus, former widow of Daniel Whitman, alias David Whitman, late of United States ship *Little Ada*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret W. Mitchell, widow of Walter P. Mitchell, late of Captain Thatcher's Independent Company, Pettis County Missouri Home Guard, and Company C, Fortieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Katharine Partridge, helpless and dependent daughter of Wesley Partridge, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Maria Mellinger, former widow of William K. Mellinger, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriett U. Bland, widow of George W. Bland, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment, and Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna A. Pearson, former widow of William Cooper, late of Company F, One hundred and fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret M. Tennant, former widow of Edward J. Cadwell, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cora F. Mitchell, helpless and dependent daughter of Seth W. Mitchell, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Carrie C. Washburn, helpless and dependent daughter of John Washburn, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment, and Company D, Thirty-sixth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Redfield, widow of Daniel W. Redfield, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Snook, helpless and dependent daughter of Dunbar Snook, late of Company E, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth J. Atherton, widow of Benjamin Atherton, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah C. Armstrong, former widow of James Clark, late of Companies I and D, Forty-first Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine Hartless, widow of Thomas Hartless, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment, and Company D, Fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret J. Miller, former widow of Jacob Benson, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ella A. Pollard, widow of Judson N. Pollard, late of Company B, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and scout and spy, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rose E. Wilcox, widow of Joseph Wilcox, late of Company C, Cavalry Battalion, Mississippi Marine Brigade, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Caroline Pemberton, widow of Uriah Pemberton, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Roberta R. Havelick, former widow of Oswald H. Rosenbaum, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Hilliard, former widow of Jesse H. Hudson, late of Company A, One hundred and sixty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Huldah A. Budd, former widow of Charles W. Stewart, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane E. Wilcox, widow of Henry F. Wilcox, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Luella M. Peterson, widow of Benjamin F. Peterson, late of Second Battery, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adell J. Squires, widow of Nelson B. Squires, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Charlotte I. Johnson, former widow of William M. Kist, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ruth Gunsallus, helpless and dependent daughter of John Gunsallus, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Estelle Palmer, widow of George H. Palmer, late of Company G, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Eighty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Cox, widow of James L. Cox, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Martin, widow of William S. Martin, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet J. Woodbury, now Dutton, former widow of Everett T. Woodbury, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Kittie Rickabaugh, widow of John G. Rickabaugh, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Laura Jane Handshy, widow of Elijah S. Handshy, late of Company B, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henry Brooks, late a nurse, United States General Hospital, West Philadelphia, Pa., and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Agnes M. Sims, widow of Lafayette Sims, late of Company G, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Diantha Barnes, widow of Andrew J. Barnes, late of Third Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Lightburn, widow of Joseph A. J. Lightburn, late brigadier general, Second Brigade, Second Division, Fifteenth Army Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Angeline McVickers, widow of John C. McVickers, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen Ragan, former widow of Francis M. Ragan, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Permelia Reeves, widow of John D. Reeves, late of Company B, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Otis Henry Cook, helpless and dependent son of Frederick Cook, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Stobie, widow of George W. Stobie, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa C. Southerland, widow of James C. Southerland, late of Capt. Gilbreath's company of Alabama Scouts and Guides, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda A. Osborn, former widow of Luther Seagrove, late of Company D, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice Benham, former widow of Joseph Hammel, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Dow Edwards, helpless and dependent son of John Edwards, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Etta F. Pickens, helpless and dependent daughter of John D. Pickens, late of Company C, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rachel J. Harland, widow of William J. Harland, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma J. McCumsey, widow of Isaac N. McCumsey, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Seventh Regiment Veteran Volunteer Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of F. W. Gerding, late special agent, Ordnance Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isaac R. Rains, helpless and dependent son of John M. Rains, late of Company C, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Speer, late of Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month, the same to be paid him without further deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.

The name of Chloe A. Bennett, helpless and dependent daughter of Rolley E. Bennett, late of Company G, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mollie Reck, widow of William L. Reck, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Garrett, widow of David Garrett, alias David Gard, late of Company F, Eighty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Bessie Garrett, helpless and dependent daughter of said Martha and David Garrett, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha Garrett the name of said Bessie Garrett shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha Garrett.

The name of Frank R. Garland, helpless and dependent son of Sherebiah Garland, late of Company D, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Hattie E. Gilliland, widow of John M. Gilliland, late of Company G, Seventy-eighth Regiment California Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Georgia Tuley, widow of David Tuley, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment, and Company A, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel Durham, helpless and dependent son of John N. Durham, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Catharine Duncan, former widow of James W. Ulmer, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Della T. Owen, widow of John S. Owen, late of Company C, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Effie Dean, former widow of Andrew Watery, late of Company K, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Pauline Ette, former widow of Wolf Becht, late of Company A, Carondelet Battalion, United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Home Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Laura A. Moore, widow of William T. Moore, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and

U. S. S. *Allegheny* and *Chicopee*, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Jenkins Dennis, widow of Charles P. Dennis, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet A. Green, former widow of Francis E. Skinner, late of Company I and Company H, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jacob H. Martz, late of Company D, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Sumpter, former widow of Carter Sumpter, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Burkett, widow of John Burkett, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Ellen R. Hatch, widow of Perry Hatch, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah A. Clark, helpless and dependent daughter of Leander Clark, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Hollowell, former widow of Washington Stroud, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Myrtle L. Hart, helpless and dependent daughter of Charles Hart, late of Company E, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cynthia M. James, former widow of George E. Stone, late of Company H, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Vaughan, former widow of James E. Vaughan, late of Fifteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Tarbox, widow of William W. Tarbox, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susannah Sprague, widow of John Sprague, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate Bressler, widow of Martin Bressler, late of Company A, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret P. Black, former widow of Luther R. Black, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane Jadwin, widow of Benjamin Jadwin, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-second Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minnie Points, helpless and dependent daughter of Abraham Points, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Sewell, widow of Sanford Sewell, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rosetta M. J. Tischer, helpless and dependent daughter of Christian Tischer, late of Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Thomas, former widow of Benjamin F. Magner, late of Company B, Twenty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca Murphy, former widow of Wilber H. Eldridge, late of Company G, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth May, widow of William C. May, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adella Easton, widow of Arago Easton, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Langer, widow of Isaac Langer, late of Companies E and A, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Burgess, former widow of Thomas Ghare, late of Company E, Ninety-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary L. Taylor, former widow of Charles W. Brickell, late of Company D, Sixty-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Doan, widow of William F. Doan, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Ochs, widow of Joseph Ochs, late of Company C, Sixteenth Regiment, and Company I, Third Regiment, New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Nellie M. Ochs, helpless and dependent daughter of said Mary A. and Joseph Ochs, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Ochs the name of said Nellie M. Ochs shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Ochs.

The name of Melissa O. Downs, widow of George Downs, late of Company D, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Nichols, widow of Edwin Nichols, late of Company C, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she

is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Harry A. Nichols, helpless and dependent son of said Mary A. and Edwin Nichols, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Nichols the name of said Harry A. Nichols shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Nichols.

The name of Anna Bell Wyvill, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas G. Wyvill, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sylvia Hitchcock, widow of George A. Hitchcock, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rhoda A. Gambee, widow of Charles B. Gambee, late colonel Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma F. Smyth, former widow of John A. Smyth, jr., late of Company B, One hundred and seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel H. Mitchell, helpless and dependent son of Richard P. Mitchell, late of First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Pennington, helpless and dependent son of Eliphalet R. Pennington, late of Company F, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rebecca Johnson, widow of John Johnson, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy A. Dodson, former widow of Alexander A. Holstine, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Rankin, helpless and dependent daughter of John Rankin, late of Company H, Eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month through a duly appointed guardian.

The name of Robert C. Pollock, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Russell, widow of Alfred W. Russell, late of Company F, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy Summers, widow of Joseph A. Summers, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Phebe Morgan, widow of John H. Morgan, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rosa Fitzpatrick, widow of William Fitzpatrick, alias Michael O'Brian, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and Company L, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary S. Runion, former widow of James T. Newberry, late of Company E, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Weeks, widow of Samuel B. Weeks, late of Company K, Seventy-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mattie L. Wade, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis M. Loud, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Esther A. Van Camp, widow of James H. Van Camp, late of Company I, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza Gnatz, widow of Paul H. Gnatz, alias Paul F. Ochs, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Joanna Gloster, widow of John Gloster, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Richard M. Johnson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna D. Abel, widow of William A. Abel, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Oscar McPike, helpless and dependent son of John McPike, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Frederick S. Chamberlin, helpless and dependent son of Henry N. Chamberlin, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edith Butler, widow of John Butler, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Watts, former widow of John T. Baker, late of Company F, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Flora Walls, helpless and dependent daughter of George Walls, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Cravens, former widow of Benjamin Parker, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isabella Martin, former widow of William Spatch, late of Company A, Second Battalion, Sixteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Prim, widow of George Prim, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amanda Trauger, widow of Paul Trauger, late of Company C, Forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clarissa Bell, widow of Thomas M. Bell, late of Company D, One hundred and second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Isabella Holt, former widow of Orren J. Holt, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Janett Millage, widow of Abraham Millage, late landsman United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice H. Bryant, widow of Permenus Bryant, late of Company H, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Vasthena Burger, widow of Jacob Burger, late of Company E, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Glennie Burger, helpless and dependent son of said Jacob and Vasthena Burger, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Vasthena Burger the name of said Glennie Burger shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Vasthena Burger.

The name of Jennie D. Matteson, former widow of David Johns, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa Taylor, widow of Edward Taylor, late of Company K, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria L. Gill, widow of John Gill, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice G. Donze, widow of Charles F. Donze, known as Charles F. Douze, late of Company A, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lenora A. Simmons, former widow of William F. Baker, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John L. B. Breighner, helpless and dependent son of Francis Breighner, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Savannah Noll, widow of George Noll, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dellah J. Feist, widow of Albert Feist, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Euphrates Huff, widow of John A. Huff, late of the U. S. S. *Tyler*, Western Gunboat Flotilla, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Gemma Trueax, widow of George M. Trueax, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lydia L. Clark, widow of Calvin W. Clark, late of Company G, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Blades, late of Company B, Permanent Battalion, Camp Russell, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and unassigned, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma L. Cryslar, widow of David Cryslar, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Malinda E. Gildewell, widow of William Gildewell, late of Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Marlatt, widow of Jacob Marlatt, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Virginia Pollard, widow of Allison W. Pollard, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John Minahan, alias John Bagley, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Adam Mickle, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Esmeralda C. Adams, former widow of Albert H. Buttrick, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lysa B. Ringold, widow of Benjamin B. Ringold, late colonel, One hundred and third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret I. Reider, widow of Emanuel Reider, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Joseph Reider, helpless and dependent son of said Margaret I. and Emanuel Reider, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Margaret I. Reider, the name of said Joseph Reider shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Margaret I. Reider.

The name of Julia A. Birge, widow of Wilbur W. Birge, late of Company I, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Peter Netz, late of Company A, Fifty-fourth Regiment, and Company D, Second Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Mary J. Miller, widow of James Miller, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Henry, widow of Charles V. Henry, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alzina S. Swobe, widow of Thomas Swobe, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and late lieutenant colonel, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Idella Norton, widow of John Norton, late of Company E, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Almera Norton, helpless and dependent daughter of said Idella and John Norton, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Idella Norton the name of said Almera Norton shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Idella Norton.

The name of Hannah C. Ritter, former widow of John C. Edington, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie Hoover, helpless and dependent daughter of Jacob Hoover, late of Company T, Ringold Battalion, and Company A, Twenty-second Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lydia Lenora Henson, widow of Thomas J. Henson, late of Company E, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Handy, widow of Edward S. Handy, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Florence E. Handy, helpless and dependent daughter of said Sarah J. and Edward S. Handy, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah J. Handy, the name of said Florence E. Handy shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah J. Handy.

The name of Mary M. Gunsolus, former widow of Mathew M. Gunsolus, late of Company K, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martin McDermott, helpless and dependent son of Michael McDermott, late of Company I, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jay Cobb, helpless and dependent son of Charles Cobb, late of Company K, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Kimball, former widow of James W. Kimball, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment, and Company G, Twentieth Regiment, Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Kinney, widow of Jireh Kinney, late unattached Twenty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Osborn, widow of Henry Osborn, late of Company E, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Reuben E. Lawrence, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Hinman, widow of Walter C. Hinman, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia D. Maynard, widow of Chauncey J. Maynard, late of Company C, Thirty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Catherine E. Brinkman, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph Brinkman, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Bonus W. Fontaine, helpless and dependent son of Simon Fontaine, late of Company H, Thirty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, Twentieth Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Louis K. Lewis, helpless and dependent son of Alexander Lewis, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Letitia A. Clifford, widow of Emery W. Clifford, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Emma M. Johnson, widow of Arthur M. Johnson, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Tracy M. Johnson, helpless and dependent son of said Emma M. and Arthur M. Johnson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Emma M. Johnson the name of said Tracy M. Johnson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Emma M. Johnson.

The name of Margaret Steele, widow of Edward Steele, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Blackburn, widow of James Blackburn, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Markham, former widow of Orville W. Smith, late of the Ninth Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna M. Amer, former widow of Joseph Amer, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Caroline Miller, widow of Herman J. Miller, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Travis H. Stilwell, helpless and dependent son of Lewis A. Stilwell, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lydia A. Gaines, former widow of Alvis Fields, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frederieke C. Anderson, widow of Asbury E. Anderson, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Otto, helpless and dependent daughter of Ludwig, alias Louis, Otto, late of Company E, Seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mattie Shepherd, helpless and dependent daughter of Ira Shepherd, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza M. Keyes, former widow of Francis H. Rasey, late of Company C, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. McDonald, widow of Luke McDonald, late of Company B, Second Battalion, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Clara A. Harlow, helpless and dependent daughter of William A. Harlow, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Angella Meredith, widow of William H. Meredith, late acting chief engineer United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda E. Buck, former widow of Elias Harvey, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Reynolds, widow of Levi Reynolds, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Melissa S. Lee, widow of Gideon E. Lee, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lucy L. Lee, helpless and dependent daughter of said Melissa S. and Gideon E. Lee, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Melissa S. Lee, the name of said Lucy L. Lee shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Melissa S. Lee.

The name of Phoebe Hamilton, widow of George W. Hamilton, late of Company F, Fortieth Regiment, and Company G, Fifty-first Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of George W. Hamilton, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Phoebe Hamilton, the name of said George W. Hamilton shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month, from and after the date of death of said Phoebe Hamilton.

The name of William N. Bridges, helpless and dependent son of Joseph Bridges, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. McCleary, widow of James H. McCleary, late of Company G, Twenty-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rissie Swords, widow of William H. Swords, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Burk, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John T. Fleener, helpless and dependent son of Samuel W. Fleener, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cora A. Trueblood, widow of Freeland Trueblood, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of David Sedore, helpless and dependent child of Isaac Sedore, late of Company A, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Julia E. Pierrepont, former widow of Charles A. Barnum, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maranda Stanfield, widow of Horatio C. Stanfield, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Myrtle Stanfield, helpless and dependent daughter of said Maranda and Horatio C. Stanfield, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Maranda Stanfield, the name of said Myrtle Stanfield shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Maranda Stanfield.

The name of Sophie P. Harris, widow of James N. Harris, late of Company C, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John Edward Harris, helpless and dependent son of said James N. Harris, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sophie P. Harris, the name of said John Edward Harris shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the death of said Sophie P. Harris.

The name of Martha Ruebel, former widow of Jacob Zeut, alias Joseph Sente, late of Company F, Twenty-ninth Regiment, and Company I,

Thirty-second Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maria C. Sinclair, widow of Sidney F. Sinclair, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet L. Potter, widow of Edward E. Potter, late captain and commodore, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy A. Leach, widow of Welcome G. Leach, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters, and Company G, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Florence Maxey, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry L. Maxey, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Lulu M. Jones, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel T. Jones, late of Company A, Eightieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lavinia Humphrey, widow of William J. Humphrey, late of Company K, One hundred and twelfth Regiment, and Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Moessner, widow of Christopher F. Moessner, late of Company K, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David O. Spencer, helpless and dependent son of Oliver Spencer, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Annie Belle Gaunt, helpless and dependent daughter of Nev Gaunt, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha I. McGinnis, widow of Joseph M. McGinnis, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John E. Markley, late of Company E, Sixty-eighth Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary J. Van Denbergh, widow of Jacob Van Denbergh, late of Company D, One hundred and twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy J. Clark, widow of Thomas J. Clark, late of Company K, One hundred and eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane McMahon, widow of Matthew McMahon, late of Company D, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Zora Hockman, helpless and dependent daughter of Aaron Hockman, late of Company F, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Callie B. Boatright, widow of John T. Boatright, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George T. Baldwin, helpless and dependent son of William L. Baldwin, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James Warren, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Catharine Macaughay, helpless and dependent daughter of James Macaughay, late of Company G, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Smith, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Slack, widow of Magnus D. Slack, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva McNett, former widow of Jacob B. McNett, late assistant surgeon, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Annie J. Page, widow of George W. Page, late of independent company, Dennison Guard, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Amanda B. Birch, widow of J. J. C. Birch, late acting medical cadet, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John Wilson, late of Company D, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rebecca Horine, widow of George M. Horine, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Bertha Blanch Weimer, helpless and dependent daughter of John S. Weimer, late of Company F, Ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ezra Shanks, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sibia Armstrong, former widow of James M. Lawrence, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice West, helpless and dependent daughter of Sylvester D. West, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Bates, widow of George Bates, late of Company H, Forty-eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary F. Lake, former widow of Joshua W. Lake, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma Park, helpless and dependent daughter of James A. Park, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Isabella Gruver, widow of John A. Gruver, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth I. E. Duffield, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas A. Duffield, late of Company B, Second Regiment California Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary L. Drake, former widow of John Herrington, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth S. Van Pelt, former widow of Gaines Brock, late of Company G, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet E. Ritter, widow of Austin Ritter, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Tuttle, widow of Henry G. Tuttle, late of Company E, Forty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth A. Pease, widow of Dallas M. Pease, late of Company A, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emily N. Wellman, widow of Norman Wellman, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa Mawhiney, widow of William I. Mawhiney, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of John H. Mawhiney, helpless and dependent son of said William I. Mawhiney, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Louisa Mawhiney, the name of said John H. Mawhiney shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Louisa Mawhiney.

The name of Emma L. Lindsay, widow of David A. Lindsay, alias James D. Hamel, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriett Jordan, widow of Lindsey Jordan, late of Company D, Fortieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cora B. Kelley, widow of James Kelley, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Adelia Mae Lee, widow of James E. Lee, late of Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Maggie Dona Lloyd, helpless and dependent daughter of Joseph Lloyd, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Israel Boyer, alias George Johnson, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Frank Haight, helpless and dependent son of Frederick G. Haight, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Bowman, helpless and dependent son of Abraham Bowman, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jessie G. Gilman, helpless and dependent daughter of Elbridge P. Gilman, late of Troop G, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Virginia Zachary, widow of John Zachary, late of Company C, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samuel Pryor, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Jane M. Henderson, widow of Henry W. Henderson, late of Company I, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Peter Boyd, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eugene Cunningham, helpless and dependent son of Moses S. Cunningham, late of Company F, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Emaline C. Lindner, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Lindner, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frances E. Parmater, former widow of John J. Parmater, late of Company A, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lillian Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Francis A. Brown, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John E. Broyles, helpless and dependent son of Henry Broyles, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and Company E, Sixth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Sarah E. Maurer, former widow of Isiah Miller, late of Company G, Seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catherine Weber, former widow of Robert R. Martin, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Diana Lucas, former widow of Nathan Lucas, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy F. Taylor, widow of Thomas G. Taylor, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Beach, helpless and dependent daughter of Willard O. Beach, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Phillips, former widow of Orrin W. Stanford, late of Company A, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Callie Oberer, widow of John Oberer, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Cain, widow of James Cain, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of James Cain, helpless and dependent son of said James Cain, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Sarah Cain the name of said James Cain shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Sarah Cain.

The name of Helena Garges, helpless and dependent daughter of Amantes Garges, late of Company A, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lottie Baughman, widow of Isaiah Baughman, late of Company C, Thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma E. Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of Thomas Brown, late of Company H, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Loretta Hoseney, helpless and dependent daughter of James R. Hoseney, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah Brantner, widow of James S. Brantner, late of Company B, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rhoda Button, widow of James W. Button, late of Company G, Ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha L. Elliott, widow of Salathiel Elliott, pensioned as Salathiel Ellet, late of Company E, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah Mowry, former widow of Jasper Lanham, late of Company M, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Emma Swalls, helpless and dependent daughter of Eli Swalls, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Zetta Swalls, helpless and dependent daughter of Eli Swalls, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah J. Parks, widow of Jasper N. Parks, late of Company B, Thirty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Haremaker, widow of Peter Haremaker, late of Company A, Fifty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Burton Walters, helpless and dependent son of Borda Walters, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Fannie E. Porter, widow of Daniel P. Porter, late of Company D, Third Battalion Rifles, Massachusetts Volunteer Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles S. Porter, helpless and dependent son of said Daniel P. Porter, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Fannie E. Porter the name of said Charles S. Porter shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Fannie E. Porter.

The name of Jane Burton, former widow of Maurice Burton, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. McGill, helpless and dependent daughter of James McGill, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Martha J. James, widow of Leander M. James, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Helen James, helpless and dependent daughter of said Leander M. James, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha J. James, the name of said Helen James shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha J. James.

The name of Betsey Palmer Mason, former widow of William H. Palmer, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Rebecca E. Brown, former widow of James M. M. Houston, late of Company L, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriett A. Lake, widow of Dewitt C. Lake, late of Company E, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha J. Sexton, helpless and dependent daughter of Isaac Sexton, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edwin E. Warren, helpless and dependent son of Edwin A. Warren, late of Company G, Nineteenth Regiment, and Company K, Seventeenth Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary E. Leroy, widow of Fred, alias Frederick, Leroy, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Louisa Engelhardt, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Engelhardt, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Dora Myers, former widow of Charles Swodes, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Flora Heath, helpless and dependent daughter of Samuel Heath, late of Company C, Third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah N. Bolinger, widow of Jacob N. Bolinger, late watchman U. S. ram *Fulton*, Mississippi Marine Brigade, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thompson S. Lozaw, helpless and dependent son of Samuel Lozaw, late of Company D, Fourth Independent Battery, New Jersey Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy C. Troupe, former widow of James L. Forgey, late of Company L, Fifteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Burgess, widow of George T. Burgess, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cassie R. Hatch, helpless and dependent daughter of Albion L. Hatch, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Veteran Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah E. Frost, widow of Charles L. Frost, late of Company F, Seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Caroline St. Denis, widow of Gideon St. Denis, late of Companies I and A, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josiah C. Hancock, helpless and dependent son of Francis M. Hancock, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia Ruth Bartlett, helpless and dependent daughter of Sylvanus Bartlett, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Werner, widow of Adam Werner, late of Capt. Kaupp's company, Seventh Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza C. Ludwig, widow of Frank Ludwig, late of Company D, Third Battalion New York Volunteer Artillery, Company D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company F, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lafayette Van Gundy, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sadie C. Steadman, former widow of Hezekiah N. Steadman, late of Company E, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Hunter C. Frampton, late of Company F, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, no deduction or rebate to be made on account of former alleged overpayment or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Helen B. Owen, widow of Robert S. Owen, late of Company A, Third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Barnes, widow of Leander P. Barnes, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah J. Pond, widow of Chandler H. Pond, late of the Twenty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha Williams, widow of Joseph T. Williams, late of Company F, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bowen, widow of George L. Bowen, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth M. Sager, widow of Garrett S. Sager, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan H. Orr, widow of Charles W. Orr, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eva J. Plante, former widow of Louis Peipker, late of Sixth Independent Company, Ohio Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Loretta McKee, helpless and dependent daughter of Amos McKee, late unassigned, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Rosella Magee, helpless and dependent daughter of James Magee, late of Company I, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Harriet Sillman, widow of John F. Sillman, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura Levenseler, helpless and dependent daughter of Henry Levenseler, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Christy, widow of Thomas J. Christy, late of Company C, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Keys, widow of William T. Keys, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of James Bartram, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

The name of Burney E. Hall, helpless and dependent son of Elijah P. Hall, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriette Skelton, widow of Samuel G. Skelton, late of Company A, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Lucy J. Sheldon, widow of Charles M. Sheldon, late of Company K, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Catharine Lenz, widow of Solomon Lenz, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Charles H. Lenz, helpless and dependent son of said Solomon Lenz, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Catharine Lenz, the name of said Charles H. Lenz shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Catharine Lenz.

The name of Harriet H. Carmical, widow of John Carmical, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan Bedell, helpless and dependent daughter of David E. Bedell, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Louisa R. Bechtel, widow of Morgan S. Bechtel, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alida A. Marshall, widow of Joseph N. Marshall, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of James E. Marshall, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph N. Marshall, \$10 of the additional pension granted herein shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Armildred Marshall, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph N. Marshall, \$10 of the additional pension granted herein shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Alida A. Marshall, the names of James E. Marshall and Armildred Marshall shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month to each of them from and after the death of said Alida A. Marshall.

The name of Eliza McDanel, widow of John McDanel, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Laona Carver, widow of Andrew J. Carver, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie L. Ransdell, widow of Andrew S. Ransdell, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Julia E. Mills, widow of Leonidas E. Mills, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Anna Sheridan, widow of John Sheridan, late of Company K, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William Francis Sheridan, helpless and dependent son of said John Sheridan, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Anna Sheridan, the name of said William Francis Sheridan shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Anna Sheridan.

The name of Abigail Merriman, widow of Henry L. Merriman, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elmar K. Coppock, helpless and dependent son of Calvin Coppock, late of Company C, Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara C. McCracken, widow of John M. McCracken, late of Company K, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. McCracken, helpless and dependent daughter of said John M. McCracken, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Clara C. McCracken, the name of said Mary A. McCracken shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Clara C. McCracken.

The name of Elecia Rexroad, widow of Maranda H. Rexroad, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Anna F. Willis, helpless and dependent daughter of Alfred Willis, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary F. Woods, widow of David Woods, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George W. Thompson, helpless and dependent son of Andrew G. Thompson, late of Company B, Forty-first Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Firkins, late of Company D, Fifty-third Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and forty-first Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ida McCoy, widow of James McCoy, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sophia Schram, widow of John Schram, late of Companies H and B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month and \$6 per month additional on account of the minor child of said John Schram until she reaches the age of 16 years, all such pension to be in lieu of that now being paid under minor's certificate No. 770933 on account of the soldier's minor child.

The name of Ellen S. Vestile, widow of George W. Vestile, late of Capt. Bassett's independent company, Ninth Regiment Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary A. Shepherd, widow of William A. Shepherd, late of Company E, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of William E. Shepherd, helpless and dependent son of said William A. Shepherd, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary A. Shepherd, the name of said William E. Shepherd shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary A. Shepherd.

The name of Susanna A. Johnson, widow of Eugene W. Johnson, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha J. Hopkins, widow of Calvin Hopkins, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eva Whittlebery, helpless and dependent daughter of William R. Whittlebery, late of Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward H. Bennett, helpless and dependent son of Lewis Bennett, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alwilda Wheeler, widow of George H. Wheeler, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Durham, helpless and dependent son of Telford Durham, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan E. Richardson, widow of Daniel W. Richardson, late of Company D, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary H. Grant, widow of Lewis A. Grant, late brigadier general and brevet major general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Dearborn, late unassigned, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Louis M. Starring, helpless and dependent son of Rosell M. Starring, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane Roberts, widow of John H. Roberts, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of John Bush, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The name of Clarence S. Hall, blind son of Andrew L. Hall, late of Company C, First Battalion Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lizzie E. Hinds, widow of Josiah D. Hinds, late of Company G, First Regiment District of Columbia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fermon L. Botkin, helpless son of Amos H. Botkin, late of Company G, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Malinda Kiniston, widow of Josiah W. Kiniston, late unassigned, One hundred and twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Cassie Norman, widow of Calvin William Norman, late of Company A, Second Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy Gabrilla Anderson, helpless daughter of Peyton W. Anderson, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Forrest, widow of Joseph Forrest, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jerry S. Fish, helpless and dependent son of Nathan S. Fish, late first lieutenant Company B, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clara Farlow, widow of Thomas Farlow, alias Thomas Jones, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alice Hingson, widow of Thomas J. Hingson, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$6 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Thomas J. Hingson until they reach the age of 16 years.

The name of Sarah E. West, widow of William P. West, late of Company C, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Edward D. Lockwood, alias George E. McDaniel, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia,

and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ethel Kingsbury, helpless daughter of Le Roy W. Kingsbury, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Mary E. Stitt, former widow of John N. Darms, late of Company B, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Fannie S. Grant, helpless child of Columbus Grant, late of Companies B and C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Robbins, widow of Leander C. Robbins, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah A. Bryan, widow of Abner G. Bryan, late musician, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William N. Ingersoll, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month.

The name of Mary J. Robb, widow of David Robb, late of Company K, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Elizabeth Ross, widow of Adam Ross, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Martha M. Childs, widow of George W. Childs, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Thibodo, widow of Stephen Thibodo, late of Troop G, United States Mounted Rifles, War with Mexico, and Company B, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nora B. Higgins, helpless child of James Higgins, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Fanny M. Jones, widow of Charles C. Jones, late acting master's mate, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amelia Hubbard, widow of Lucius F. Hubbard, late colonel Fifth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Edward H. Bennett, helpless son of Lewis Bennett, late of Company B, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harriet N. Scilpp, widow of William H. Scilpp, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month, such pension to cease upon proof that the soldier is still living.

The name of Emily A. Netson, widow of William J. Netson, late of Company E, Fifty-fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Johanna Neil, widow of John Neil, late of Company E, Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Fifty-first Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Hannah M. Kingsley, widow of Thomas G. Kingsley, late colonel Twenty-sixth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Grace M. Copeland, helpless daughter of James Copeland, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, One hundred and thirty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and Company H, Ninth Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susette Noyes, widow of Cyrus S. Noyes, late of Company B, Nineteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Albert B. Lawrence, helpless son of Edward Lawrence, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha A. Dunbar, former widow of Clark Austin, late of Company C, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Fuller, former widow of Edward E. Tracy, late first Lieutenant Company D, and captain Company I, One hundred and fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert B. McCumber, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eva Fifield, blind and helpless daughter of Leonard Fifield, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Edna C. Wilson, former widow of Erwin Phifer, late of Company B, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Miranda Green, widow of Elbridge F. Green, late of Company L, Second Regiment New York Veteran Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Frank C. Myrick, late scout, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emiline Hartley, widow of James R. Hartley, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Nancy Cook, former widow of Alexander Cook, late unassigned Eighth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Susan J. St. John, widow of John P. St. John, late captain Company C, Sixty-eighth Regiment, and Lieutenant colonel One hundred and forty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Austin L. Myers, helpless and dependent son of Thomas W. Myers, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Teters, widow of John K. Teters, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Ellen Temperance Smith, helpless and dependent daughter of George W. Smith, late of Company C, Fifteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. Williams, helpless and dependent son of Elias B. Williams, late of Company B, Second Regiment Kansas State Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Flora A. Nelson, widow of Paul Nelson, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of George W. Johnson, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Nancy Herrald, widow of Benjamin Herrald, late of Company C, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret I. Halbert, helpless daughter of Ephraim F. Halbert, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Catharine A. Atkinson, former widow of Richard Watts, late of Company G, First Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Albert W. Cherry, helpless son of James M. Cherry, late of Company L, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Ella Bailey, helpless daughter of Joseph Bailey, late captain, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sally Goins, widow of Samuel Goins, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Eliza M. Miller, widow of James H. Miller, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ella E. Pangburn, widow of William Pangburn, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Ralph H. Pangburn, helpless child of said William Pangburn, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Ella E. Pangburn the name of said Ralph H. Pangburn shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of the said Ella E. Pangburn.

The name of Cecelia B. Chauncey, widow of John S. Chauncey, late commodore, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Virginia Dodd, widow of John E. Dodd, late of Battery F, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Margaret Scholten, widow of Charles Scholten, late of Company E, Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Capitola V. Harsh, helpless daughter of Daniel Harsh, late of Company H, Fifty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Amelia E. Drake, widow of Nathaniel S. Drake, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Frances D. Miller, widow of John H. Miller, late of Company I, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Mary Piller, widow of William Piller, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Adah E. Allen, widow of George W. Allen, late of Company A, One hundred and tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Samantha Hitchcock, widow of Isaac W. Hitchcock, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Sarah M. Willison, widow of George W. Willison, late of Company M, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet L. Stone, blind and helpless daughter of James F. Stone, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Harriett A. Erb, widow of Ira Erb, late of Company B, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Augustus E. Dodd, helpless son of William A. Dodds, late of Company H, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Flora H. Whitney, helpless daughter of Alva S. Whitney, late of Company E, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of George W. Yocum, helpless son of Samuel H. Yocum, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James G. Weyant, helpless son of William B. Weyant, late of Companies M and A, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Chloe T. Hutchison, former widow of William T. Hutchison, late of Company G, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Minerva C. McMillan, helpless child of James W. McMillan, late colonel Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and brigadier general United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Hayes, late acting assistant surgeon United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth H. Peggs, widow of Joseph E. E. Peggs, late of Company C, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Josephine M. Higgins, widow of Henry F. Higgins, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Henrietta Magee, widow of David W. Magee, late lieutenant colonel Eighty-sixth Regiment and colonel Forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ann Carman, former widow of Albert Quackenbush, late of Company I, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, First Regiment New York Provisional Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Alma L. Bruce, helpless daughter of John A. Bruce, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Martha Griggs, widow of William M. Griggs, late of Company B, One hundred and fortieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Rose Mercer, widow of Samuel Mercer, late of Company I, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The name of Harriet V. M. Cavanaugh, widow of Harry G. Cavanaugh, late captain Company I, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and colonel, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Susan W. Allison, widow of James N. Allison, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and brigadier general, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ruth A. Day, widow of Absalom N. Day, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Hallie N. Day, helpless and dependent child of said Absalom N. Day, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *Provided further*, That in the event of the death of Ruth A. Day, the name of said Hallie N. Day shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$20 per month from and after the date of death of said Ruth A. Day.

The name of Sarah McIntire, widow of Henry McIntire, late of Company K, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mahala P. Berry, former widow of George W. York, late of Company K, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ida M. Jackson, helpless and dependent daughter of Preston Jackson, alias Barrett, late of Company A, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary S. McKibbin, widow of Chambers McKibbin, late brigadier general, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Dollie Cosens, helpless child of Henry Clay Cosens, late of Company E, First Regiment, and Company C, Thirtieth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Kate M. Smith, former widow of Dan Adams, late of Company D, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles Layton, helpless son of John Layton, late of Company I, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, protests against the passage of the bill now under consideration will be as unavailing as those heretofore interposed to pension bills and to measures making serious drains upon the Public Treasury. No appeals to the Senate avail when bills are presented calling for Federal appropriations. Over and over again I have challenged attention to the extravagance of this Congress and to its failure to deal with constructive legislation.

Our duty following the World War was to deal with the vital problems which the war produced. The treaty of Versailles called for prompt consideration. Our international relations demanded adjustment. We had been associated with the allied nations in the titanic conflict precipitated by the mad ambitions of the German and Austro-Hungarian Empires. The defeat of the enemy devolved responsibilities upon the victorious nations and called for the highest statesmanship and also required cordial cooperation upon the part of those who had joined in the peace treaty. Domestic problems were more or less involved in the solution of our international problems. It was therefore necessary that questions involved in the settlement of the war be promptly considered and acted upon. But we have refused to ratify the treaty or to cooperate with the Allies in settling the questions resulting from the war. Neither Germany nor Austria-Hungary knows what the attitude of this Nation will be with respect to the terms of peace or the cognate questions involved. Our late allies are left in a state of bewilderment because of the uncertain and equivocal attitude of this Nation.

At the conclusion of the war the allied nations had the right to believe that this great Republic would not only participate in framing the terms of peace but would exert a powerful influence in the enforcement of such terms and in bringing peace and order to a distracted world. Our attitude, however, has been disappointing both to our allies and to our defeated foes. We have not only refused to support the treaty affirmatively, but our conduct has been the equivalent of active opposition to its enforcement.

It has been charged that our position has given encouragement to revolutionary and reactionary groups in the Central Empires to resist the terms of the treaty. Whether that be true or not, I think conditions justify the statement that our refusal to participate in the treaty, or actively associate ourselves with the allied nations in bringing about peace and stable conditions in Europe, has been an impediment to the efforts made in that direction and has postponed the advent of that period when order and peace and national and international good will shall obtain.

I concede there may be an honest difference of opinion upon the part of the American people concerning the acceptance without modification of the terms of the peace treaty, including the covenant of the League of Nations. Whether or not its provisions without modification or reservation were acceptable, there is still a duty resting upon this Nation to do its part in determining the questions which the war raised. Notwithstanding the ocean divides us from Europe, we are interested in Europe and in her people and in the problems which she has to face. We may attempt to escape the currents which carry nations in their powerful sweep, but isolation and absolute independence is impossible. Against our will and without our fault we were drawn into the World War.

The American people are demanding a merchant marine. They have willingly expended more than \$3,000,000,000 in building and purchasing ships. They appreciate the fact that their prosperity depends upon foreign commerce. We want the American flag to be seen upon every sea and in every port. We realize we must trade with the peoples of the world, that our raw materials and finished products must find their way to all parts of the earth, and that our ships must return laden with the products of other lands. Europe has furnished us the most important field for our surplus products. The rehabilitation of Europe depends upon whether her people can obtain from the United States not only raw materials but our finished products. The unhappy people of the impoverished nations of Europe must have peace and stable and secure conditions before they are able to obtain from this country those commodities indispensable to the life and welfare of the people. The renaissance of Europe and the prosperity of her people will contribute to the prosperity of the American people and to the development of our resources and industries.

Our country does not occupy that high station which it should have assumed in this great world crisis. Its wealth, its power, its ideals, its great contribution to the cause of international justice, made it the commanding figure among all the nations of the world. It was not only the leader in material things but its splendid service in the great world conflict gave it the moral leadership which no nation could dispute. Unfortunately we have not held high the standard, and there be many who believe that we have permitted the symbol of leadership to drop from our grasp. Has this country occupied that high position of constructive statesmanship which our domestic problems required? Has there not been upon our part a failure to measure up to the high standard of duty in dealing with the pressing domestic problems? Has there not been failure to discharge international responsibilities?

The Republican Party has been in power in the legislative branch of the Government for more than one year. The record which has been made is disappointing to all patriotic Americans. Within a short time there will be an adjournment, and the people of the Nation will have an opportunity to weigh in the balance the achievements of this Republican Congress and determine whether its record is of such a character as to merit the confidence and support of the electorate of this Republic.

I have stated upon a number of occasions that the Republican Party assumed control in both branches of Congress promising economy and measures of reform. Pledges were made that important legislation would be enacted in the interest of domestic peace and for the welfare and prosperity of the people. There are some measures to the credit of the party in power, but the constructive measures which have been passed have been marred by serious and indeed fundamental defects and imperfections.

Instead of developing a spirit of self-reliance and independence upon the part of the people and encouraging a spirit of

local self-government, efforts have been made to further atrophy the States and destroy individual initiative and strengthen the bureaucratic and consolidating tendencies which are so powerfully operating throughout the land. People have been encouraged to subordinate their States, to weaken their powers, and to emasculate their authority.

I can perhaps be justly charged with dwelling with irritating persistency upon this note. Upon a number of occasions I have pointed to the legislation of recent years which is reducing the States to mere shadows of their former spirit and power and to the corresponding development by the Federal Government of authority not granted to it and in the exercise of which it has been guilty of unwarranted usurpations. With the termination of the war Congress was required to legislate for the restoration of peace-time conditions. The situation called for wisdom and statesmanship of the highest order. Revenue laws which were the product of the war should have been modified, revised, and some provisions repealed. A system of taxation should have been devised that did not penalize thrift and savings but which taxed extravagance and waste. The majority party has lacked the courage, if not the ability, to meet this perplexing problem of taxation, and as a result industry is hampered and the prosperity of the people menaced. Legislation has been suggested and measures have been passed which were wholly without merit, but were designed to meet appeals and demands not founded in justice or resting upon the thought of the people's welfare. There has been too much of a disposition to recognize classes and groups, and consequently to enact class and group legislation. I think it can be truthfully charged that much of the projected legislation of this Congress has been destructive of the concept of national unity and freedom from class consciousness and has fostered the dangerous heresy that legislation should be for classes and special interests. There are always many difficulties, and indeed perils, attending the transformation from war to peace.

It would not be possible, nor have I the time to enter into a discussion of the psychological processes through which a nation passes from peace to war or from war back to the spirit and habits of peace. Laws must be enacted and repealed in effectuating these changes, and sometimes constitutions and fundamental charters have been stretched or overturned. We have not approached the serious questions involved in this transition from a war status to a peace status with that broad and comprehensive vision essential to correct and statesmanlike action. I repeat, the legislative record of the majority party in Congress is disappointing. There has been too much dodging, too much equivocation, too much of the subtle and Machiavellian spirit which result in delays, compromises, illusions, false hopes, and in the end disappointment, resentment, and bitter antagonisms which undermine the faith and confidence of many in their Government and lead to secret and covert attacks upon its integrity. One culpable propensity upon the part of the majority party is to foster and encourage extravagant appropriations.

I stated a few moments ago that the policy of the Republican Party had been to weaken individuality, enervate States, and disintegrate community life, and to encourage a disposition to seek Federal assistance for individuals and States and to insist upon the assertion of unauthorized power by the Federal Government in the interests of individuals and for private advantage.

I have heretofore directed attention to the weakening of individual and State spirit and pride and to the increasing appetite for Federal benefactions. It has seemed to me that there has been a violent recrudescence of past Republican policies which brought to its support a vast army of voters. That party was supposed to be the faithful advocate and unswerving friend of bounties and pensions and tariffs and special and discriminatory legislation. I think it is not a partisan statement, but merely the recitation of a historic fact, when I say that for many years the Republican Party enacted legislation demanded by certain industries and business enterprises throughout the land. Protection became the formidable rampart behind which vested and special interests, predatory forces, corrupt and sinister organizations protected themselves, and from which they sallied forth from time to time as did the robbers and pirates of old to despoil the weak and the provident and the peaceful of the limited substance which their industry and economy had enabled them to accumulate.

So this Congress has been profligate in its expenditures and responsive to the demands for bounties, pensions, and appropriations without reference to merit or regard for the Constitution or the principles of justice and fair dealing.

A short time ago we passed a bill carrying \$65,000,000 per annum as additional pensions to the survivors of the Civil War

and to their alleged dependents. Only a few months prior to the passage of that bill Congress had passed a measure granting large increases to the same classes. When the measure last referred to was before the House and Senate committees representatives of various organizations promoting the legislation appeared and declared that if the demands embodied in the then pending measure were granted no further requests would ever be made for pension legislation in behalf of those who had in any way been connected with the Civil War. At that time there were, as I recall, amounts being paid annually to the survivors of the Civil War aggregating more than \$220,000,000. Within a few months after the bill was passed there was a nation-wide movement demanding the passage of what is known as the Fuller bill. When that measure was before the committee, representations were made that if it were passed that would satisfy the demands of the survivors of the Civil War and their families and that no further legislation would be asked for. That bill is now a law. Under it and existing legislation nearly \$300,000,000 will be paid during the coming fiscal year as pensions to the survivors of the Civil War and to those who claim benefactions and Federal grants through them. It must be understood that millions and tens of millions of dollars are annually paid to widows of soldiers whose marriages were comparatively recent and though they have had numerous husbands. Notwithstanding the promises made by those who have been representatives of organizations engaged in securing pensions, we now have before us a bill that provides for pensions for a large number of individuals. A number of those who are to receive pensions under this bill are obtaining pensions under the Fuller bill and, I think, under other enactments.

It is manifest that there will be no limit to the demands for pensions. We satisfy the demands of to-day and additional ones are urged upon the morrow. And this is to be expected. We have encouraged the view that the Government has unlimited resources and that there is something honorable in obtaining contributions and appropriations from the Federal Treasury. The view is being encouraged that for any form of service under the Government a pension should be granted. Indeed, there is an active school of thought in our land that teaches that it is the duty of the Federal Government to care for the people in all parts of the land; that it should provide for the indigent and needy; care for the sick and disabled; support the derelicts and ne'er-do-wells; provide insurance without cost or, if with cost, at a price so low as to be negligible in amount to all persons; pension the aged and infirm; and generally assume control over the people, their private concerns, and business activities. We often hear of old-age pensions, and compensation for those who are injured, and the rehabilitation of all classes who have been disabled, and vocational training for men and women who have sustained injury, or who, because of their incapacity for one line of work, desire to engage in some other. The National Government is to be the father of the people, and spread its omnipotent hand over individuals, communities, and States, and rule and reign without limit or restriction. Of course, when the Constitution is broken down, and the dual form of government provided in the Constitution is no longer recognized, these views will become more or less prevalent and find strong supporters.

Let it be understood that I am discussing grants by the Federal Government, not by the States. It may well be that the latter should provide a system of pensions for the aged and indigent. Indeed there is a duty resting upon the States to provide for certain of its citizens, to afford opportunity for education to the children, and aid to the helpless and distressed.

But I will address myself to the measure before us. Let me briefly refer to some of the acts of Congress providing for pensions. The acts of July 14, 1862, and March 3, 1873, section 46037, Revised Statutes, provided pensions for former members of the Military and Naval Establishments who had incurred wounds, disease, or other disability in the service. The pensions were graduated from \$6 per month to \$100 per month, according to degree of disability. The disability pension act applied to all soldiers and sailors of the Union who served prior to the declaration of war against Germany.

Disability pensions are granted without regard to length or place of service or whether the service was in war or in times of peace. The beneficiary may have served but a day or an hour, and the disability claimed may have no relation to such service, but be of entirely independent origin. This disability pension is granted not only to those whose names were upon the rolls during the Civil War but those who were connected with the Indian wars or the War with Spain.

A few days ago we passed what is known as the Sells bill, which calls for millions of dollars annually for pensions for those who were in the Spanish-American War. Under that bill

pensions are granted for mere service in the Army or Navy to all persons upon reaching the age of 62 years. They are to receive pensions whether they are rich or poor, whether perfect in health and the possessors of thousands of dollars annually by way of income or otherwise. The pensions are likewise granted to all persons without attaining that age if they are suffering from a disability, though the disability has no relation whatever to such service in the Army or Navy.

Some of the bills which we have passed for pensions can not be defended, and they establish precedents that will be of serious import to our country.

A few hours ago the House of Representatives passed a measure granting service pensions the aggregate of which will probably be \$2,000,000,000. There seems to be a total disregard of the theory of pensions, of the question of how the money is to be raised to meet the billions of dollars appropriated from the Public Treasury. Congress seems to be mad on the question of appropriations. We proceed as do some foolish individuals who have suddenly become the possessors of fortunes. They spend it in extravagance and riotous living and in an incredibly short time find themselves in the bankruptcy courts. Nothing seems to restrain the propensity of this Congress to spend money. I have repeatedly denounced the extravagance and the wasteful appropriations made and shall continue to protest against this insane policy, which can have but one result. It tends to undermine the morality of the people and will lead to national bankruptcy.

Mr. DIAL. I discover in the bill that pensions are granted to "former widows." Does that mean that they have married again, and we are giving them a pension because they have a second husband?

Mr. KING. The Senator from South Carolina, I am afraid, is somewhat of a novice in pension legislation. Widows to the nth degree may obtain pensions.

Mr. DIAL. I did not know the legislation was designed to take care of second husbands. I was merely trying to learn.

Mr. KING. There is no limitation. A woman may have been married 10 or 15 or 20 times, but if she at any time was the widow of some man who was entitled to a pension, if she subsequently becomes a widow, she obtains a pension.

Mr. DIAL. I was struck with the novel expression "former widow."

Mr. KING. The Fuller Act, approved May 1, 1920, was a Civil War service pension act. It grants to every surviving soldier of the Civil War who served 90 days, and who was honorably discharged or who was discharged for disability incurred in the service without having served 90 days, or is presently on the pension rolls under any general or special act, a monthly pension of \$50, which is increased to a maximum of \$72 in cases where the soldier is helpless and requires the attention of other persons. To the surviving widows of soldiers of the Civil War who served 90 days or who are pensionable under the act that act grants a pension of \$30 per month, with the limitation that the widow shall have married the soldier prior to June 27, 1905—40 years subsequent to the close of the Civil War.

It was intended by Congress, as I understood the attitude of the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], that the Fuller Act should be liberal enough to provide for all properly pensionable surviving veterans or widows of veterans who served for 90 days in the Civil War.

It is not contended that the word "service" means actual service upon the battle field or in any fighting unit. A man is in service if his name is upon the roll, though he was never within a thousand miles of a battle field and never saw a gun or participated in any skirmish or in any form of military or naval operations. It must be remembered that we have abandoned the policy of granting only "invalid" pensions; we are firmly committed to the policy of granting "service" pensions. It was intended by Congress that this act should forestall and eliminate many thousands of special pension bills which are annually offered and many of which are passed in Congress. It has been estimated that two-thirds of the bills offered in the House of Representatives in the present Congress have been special pension bills and that these have exceeded in number 10,000.

Let me add that, in my opinion, the Fuller bill and all of the preceding pension bills and this bill now before us will not prevent the introduction of a multitude of special and private pension bills in the future, thousands and tens of thousands of which will become laws. Why, Mr. President, these pension bills, like Tennyson's brook, will go on and on forever. We will not only grant pensions to those who claim to have been connected in some degree, remote or direct, with military or

naval operations, but we are so obsessed with the idea of pensions that we will build up a civil pension list that will impose upon the taxpayers of this country hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Indeed, if we pass the pending pension bills in this Congress there will be imposed upon the people of the United States for the coming fiscal year not \$1,000,000,000 but there will be imposed upon the people approximately \$3,000,000,000 for pensions.

When a Republican Congress some years ago appropriated \$1,000,000,000 for all purposes it drove the Republican Party from power at the next election. The American people are occasionally aroused to the necessity of economy and insist that waste and extravagance upon the part of their public servants shall cease. I see, I confess, no evidence at the present time of any eagerness upon the part of the American people for economy in the administration of public affairs. We can not appeal, apparently, from a Philip drunk to a Philip sober, because there is no Philip sober now. When it comes to the matter of appropriations we are all drunk with the desire for Federal assistance, for burglarizing the Treasury of the United States.

It is immaterial that the Treasury is empty, that it may be like the cupboard which is bare; there will be an insistent demand that additional taxes be imposed upon the people, and still more taxes, regardless of the fact that every dollar of taxes which is imposed ultimately must rest upon the bowed back of the laboring man and the ultimate consumer.

There are many foolish people who entertain the idea that all taxes levied will be paid by the merchant, the banker, those who have large incomes and extensive property holdings. But a little reflection will convince us that if we increase the burden of taxes upon the merchant he passes them on to the individuals who purchase his commodities, and so it is with most forms of our Federal system of taxation—the men who pay the taxes pass the burden on to the ultimate consumer, and finally the laboring man, the man of slender resources, sustains most of the burdens imposed through the profligate and wasteful appropriations made by Congresses and legislative departments of States or political subdivisions. One is led to the conclusion that the people believe there is no limit to the capacity of the Government to meet obligations.

We are crying out against high prices; we know that high prices, in part, are superinduced by the vast volume of credit money and of bonds which are the basis of credit that were issued during the war through which we have passed. Yet whenever there is an effort to contract the basis of credit to the end that prices may be reduced in a normal and perhaps in a legitimate and proper way, we are immediately confronted with the situation that some particular branch of industry or industrial activity will be unduly affected to its disadvantage and to its serious, if not permanent, injury. Nevertheless our Republican friends here in Congress on the eve of adjournment do not seem to appreciate the importance of making a record for economy, but seem to be more concerned in greater expenditures, greater profligacy in the appropriations which are made, as if they expected to derive some advantage in the coming election by reason of the fact that they have made such enormous appropriations.

It used to be urged, Mr. President, in support of pensions that if the money were appropriated it would justify the party in power in the continuation of high tariffs in order that there might be larger accretions to the Treasury of the United States, and there were many people who seemed to conceive a close connection between enormous pensions and high tariff. High tariff, it was said, brought large sums into the Treasury, and enormous pensions would dissipate those funds, and so there would be a sort of perpetual motion, a circle created in the land.

Mr. President, I want, however, to acquit my Republican friends of being the sole offenders in extravagance in appropriations made in this Congress. The minority party can not affirm that its skirts are entirely clear. The appetite for Federal appropriations is an all-consuming one, and is not restricted or confined to class or section or party. Whenever we can get money out of the Treasury of the United States the disposition is to get it, and to get it quickly, and to get it often, and to persist in getting it. It is not a picture of which we can be proud, in my humble opinion, when we witness the extent and character of the appropriations that have been made during the present Congress.

Returning to the point that I was discussing, the House at this session, if my figures are correct, has passed more than 2,926 special pension bills; and in addition, as I have stated, there have been passed through the House these other bills—the Fuller bill, the Sells bill, and omnibus bills—carrying millions and tens of millions of dollars.

I understand that it was the purpose of the Senate committee to eliminate from the bills pending before that committee those claims and those cases which were provided for in the Fuller bill. The result was that out of the 2,926 House bills and more than 1,900 Senate bills pending before that committee the Senate committee culled out 686 bills and incorporated them in the measure now before us, known as H. R. 12530. This bill was reported to the Senate a few days ago by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], accompanied by an elaborate report containing more than 280 pages of closely printed matter. Although the committee intended, as I am advised, not to include within this bill any cases which were covered by the Fuller Act, the fact is that the bill contains the cases of more than 54 individuals alleged to be widows who have married and remarried, but are now widows, who are pensionable under the general law as construed and applied by the Bureau of Pensions in cases where the remarriage of the widow has been dissolved by death or divorce. There is therefore no reason and no purpose in having these cases included in this bill.

The bill also contains 65 cases of widows of soldiers who served for less than 90 days and are not pensionable except under disability pension laws. I submit that special legislation of this kind is discriminatory in character, is unfair, and can not be defended. If one soldier who served less than 90 days is entitled to a service pension, then every soldier who has served less than 90 days is entitled to a service pension, and it is rank discrimination to approve and report favorably cases of this character.

If Congress desires to pension veterans of the Civil War who served but 60 days and who were honorably discharged it should pass an act for this purpose, so that all soldiers of this class may be treated with justice and equity as between themselves. I pause to inquire if this—if I may be pardoned the vernacular of the speech—is a "feeler" with a view ultimately to breaking down this legislative wall which for many years has held back, perhaps, an increased tide of applications for pensions. I presume there was some reason prompting Congress to fix 90 days as the limit of service before pensions would be granted merely for service. That has been, I understand, the unbroken policy in the past. I understand that that is the law, that before one is entitled to a service pension he must have had his name upon the rolls of the military or the naval branch of the Government for at least 90 days. We are breaching this rule. This bill breaks down this wall and announces now that a man need not have had his name upon the rolls for 90 days in order to obtain a pension. Of course, we all understand that he need not have been wounded; he need not have been injured; it is not necessary that he should have incurred any disability while in the service in order to obtain a pension. The mere fact that his name was upon the roll for 90 days, though he was in no camp, though he may never have gone a thousand yards from his home, entitles him to a pension, and that notwithstanding the fact that he may be worth millions and be the recipient of a large sum annually from private investments. Not satisfied with a general service pension, this bill is edging along the way of granting service pensions to men who served less than 90 days.

Mr. President, there may be reasons for breaking down this rule. There may be ample justification for the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the committee and those members of the committee who followed him in his recommendations with respect to this bill, but if so, none has been submitted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCORMICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator seems to forget that the rule to which he refers was broken down long ago. This omnibus bill provides pensions for 652 persons, of whom 555 are women and 97 are men. The great bulk of the beneficiaries are women, and a great many of the women are divorced women. The bill is really designed, among other things, to pay alimony to divorced women. Now, that may be a good rule, but even that is not a new one. Of course, the pension is limited to the woman who is not to blame for the divorce; but if you can find a woman applying for a pension who has been divorced anywhere in the United States, and who is to blame for it, I should like to know what her name is.

Mr. KING. I am very glad to receive the suggestions of the Senator from Colorado; they illustrate the madness that has taken possession of Congress in its desire to give gratuities and pensions and bounties to thousands and hundreds of thousands and ultimately to millions of the people of the United States.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. KING. I do.

Mr. DIAL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he ever heard of a man who recently died worth \$7,000,000 who was drawing a pension?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. DIAL. I have heard of it. I did not know whether it was true or not.

Mr. KING. There is no question about it. There was a man, the value of whose property was \$7,000,000, who received for services in an important position in the Government for years a large salary, and who later resigned that position to assume a legislative place of influence and honor, in which position he received a large salary, and during all that time he was the possessor of great wealth.

Why, Mr. President, for that matter, I have before me a book recently printed by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, coming from the Division of Economics and History, entitled "Federal Military Pensions in the United States." It was written by Prof. William H. Glasson, professor of political economy and social science at Trinity College, North Carolina.

It was edited by Prof. David Kinley, professor of political economy in the University of Illinois, and a member of the committee of research of the endowment. It was printed in 1918. If I had the time, I should be glad to invite the attention of the Senator and others who are interested to the frauds which have been perpetrated upon the Government of the United States under the name of pensions, and to the wrongs which have been committed, and to the prostitution of the pension system in the United States.

Let me read this sentence. The editor says:

The evil influence of the above trend on the moral and patriotic character of the pensioners themselves soon became evident. Many of them came to look upon their pensions as rewards for service rather than as tokens of the country's appreciation of their patriotism. But the pension which any country can ordinarily pay is wholly inadequate if regarded as a reward for services. Naturally, therefore, the pensioners insisted on larger pensions, and, assisted by the claim agent and the politician, they pushed their claims until the financial drain on the country became a serious one. This is likely to happen in a democracy.

One great writer has stated that one of the evils to be feared in a democracy is a civil pension and a military pension system. One of the specters that appears in the pathway of our Nation is that which results from the growing disposition upon the part of the American people to establish a permanent Federal pension system. This spirit is leading to demands not only for Federal military and naval pensions but also for civil pensions, and ultimately it will extend, under this paternalistic trend of our country, to the granting of pensions to the aged and to the infirm, to the widow and to the orphan, notwithstanding the police powers of the States, and the duties and the obligations resting upon the States, if there shall be indigent people within their borders needing support, to properly care for them. The virus of socialism is spreading and destructive heresies are gaining support. States are being urged to abandon their duties and yield to the Federal Government the sovereign powers which they possess.

Mr. President, we should fight against this effort, which seeks, in the language of Marshall, to "compound the people of all the States into one mass, and to confer upon the National Government the authority which, under our form of government, is with the States and the people within the States."

Mr. DIAL. It will make mendicants and vagrants of them after a while.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when a malignant disease attacks, its development must be arrested or it will speedily destroy its victim. There may not be a happy parallel between the illustration just given and the situation of the Government, but it nevertheless is true of any government that if evils exist which corrode or affect the body politic or the moral attributes of the people, and they are not checked, they will affect the entire body politic.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator there is no promise of immortality to this Republic. Its duration depends upon the justice and righteousness of the people. The spirit of Locke and Milton and Montesquieu and the heroic figures who held the torch of liberty preceding the founding of this Republic rested upon the immortal men who gave us the Declaration of Independence and wrote the Constitution of these United States. No human government is perfect, nor can the finite mind conceive or execute a perfect thing. Nevertheless, there was established a government dedicated to the proposition that all men were equal and that justice should be the basis of all governmental authority. Influenced by the spirit which actuated the fathers and applying the principles of the Government which

they established, there was developed upon this continent the mightiest Nation the world has ever seen. Moreover, it is the freest Nation under which any people ever lived. It recognizes the individual as sovereign and as the source of authority and power. The spirit of independence possessed by our fathers developed strong, virile men and women and local communities in which the principles of free government found full expression. Each State was sovereign, a republic, a government exercising the powers of a sovereign government. The people protested against worn-out creeds—religious and political—and became a great force—moral and political—throughout the world. They believed that "an irreducible minimum of compulsion is the very essence of good government." They wanted no centralized authority, no autocratic power, no deadly bureaucracy, but strong individuals and local forums in which the virtues of local self-government could be exhibited.

Prof. Lieber states:

Let everything that is in favor of power be closely construed, and everything in favor of the security of the citizen and the protection of the individual comprehensively, for the simple reason that power is power; it is able to care for itself and tend by its nature to increase, while the citizen needs protection.

This liberty loving, sturdy people founded Commonwealths, built towns and cities, and, crossing a mighty continent, have builded a Nation that stands out as the highest example of a representative democracy and possesses that majesty which alone can be found in a government which is the embodiment of the people's will.

The work which the English race began when it colonized North America is destined to go on until every land on the earth's surface that is not already the seat of an old civilization shall become English in its language, in its political habits, and traditions. The race thus spread over both hemispheres, and from the rising to the setting sun, will not fail to keep that sovereignty of the sea and that commercial supremacy which it began to acquire when England stretched its arm across the Atlantic to the shores of Virginia and Massachusetts. The world's business will be transacted by English-speaking people to so great an extent that whatever language any man may have learned in his infancy he will find it necessary sooner or later to learn to express his thoughts in English.

Such were the words of John Fiske in his "American Political Ideals." And this statement is vindicated in the progress which this Nation has made.

But the strength of the Nation rests upon the strength of the individuals and upon the capacity of the people for local self-government. If individualism is crushed and the capacity for local self-government destroyed and the principles which constitute the basis of this Republic are departed from, then this Republic will be endangered. This movement toward paternalism must be arrested and the rights of the people and the States jealously guarded. There must be no submergence of the rights of the States, and no Federalism, drawing to itself by the gaudy trappings of power the great States which swing in their orbits along predestined and fixed paths.

Let me recur to the book I was reading from when I digressed for a moment:

The moral degeneration caused in time by the changing view of the true character of pensions led also to the evil of extending them to men whose service was brief and resulted in no injury to them. Moreover, pensions were taken without compunction by some men who, while technically entitled to them, had other means of adequate support and, indeed, were sometimes rich, to say nothing of young widows of old soldiers. For such people to take pensions is to throw a shadow of graft on the whole system.

Mr. President, there are pages in this volume which explain with more or less detail the pension system in the United States and some of the evils which have developed in the application of that system.

I have repeatedly said, and I wish to reiterate the statement, that the men who gave their lives for their country should be remembered with gratitude and their widows and their children should be generously treated by a grateful Nation. The men who are wounded in the service of their country, who incur disabilities in such service, should likewise be generously and liberally cared for by the Republic. I believe in generous treatment in behalf of those who are suffering from disabilities resulting from service to their country.

But I can not bring my mind to accept a policy of indiscriminate service pensions, to give pensions to everybody who may have served for a few days, notwithstanding his wealth, regardless of his physical condition, though he may be worth millions and though his health may be wholly unimpaired. I can find in my conscience no justification for the application of the pension system to cases of that character.

The bill before us contains about 170 cases of widows who can not establish in the Pension Office a legal status as the widow of the deceased soldier. These include women who at the time they claim to have married the soldier were the undivorced, legal wives of other men, and hence were guilty of bigamy in assuming marital relations with the soldier, and other

women who attempted to marry the soldier at a time when the soldier himself had a living wife, and other women who have forfeited their rights to pensions by moral irregularities. The Pension Bureau seems to recognize common-law marriages and to accord the widows of such marriages a pensionable status. The cases referred to are cases where even a common-law marriage could not legally have been contracted between the parties. Congress has been liberal, indeed, in according widows who married soldiers of the Civil War within 40 years after the close of the war a pensionable status, and Congress should, therefore, insist that such marriages come within the sanction of the common law and of the marriage statutes of the several States. It is vicious, indeed, to encourage the bringing in of pension claims of this character.

The bill contains 75 cases of widows who married soldiers subsequent to June 27, 1905. Congress has fixed a 40-year limit on soldier marriages, and I can see no reason why there should be a departure from that policy and the adoption of a different one by these special acts, though they be carried in an omnibus bill of the character of the one under consideration.

If one widow has married a soldier since June 27, 1905, is to be granted a pension, then every widow of a Civil War veteran who married the soldier after June 27, 1905, should be given a pensionable status. This should be done by general act of Congress, and not by these special bills which have been so numerous. Special acts in such cases are discriminatory, improper, and unfair.

The bill contains 127 cases of widows who are presently on the pension rolls and who under the Fuller Act are entitled to be pensioned at \$30 per month, who are asking to have their pensions increased to \$35, \$40, \$50, and \$72 per month on the ground that they are helpless or have helpless children. It is very much doubted if the bounty of Congress to widows ought to be extended in any case beyond \$30 per month as provided in the Fuller Act. If exceptions are to be made—and I do not affirm that conditions may not be of such a character as to call for the rigid application of the rule referred to—and if Congress and the special committees of Congress approve and report claims of this character, there will be no end of the flood of bills which will be offered to increase pensions above the rates fixed by law.

Mr. McCUMBER. Do I understand the Senator to say that the bill contains the names of widows who are granted \$72 a month?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator call my attention to some of them?

Mr. KING. I would have to take a few moments to do so, but I feel sure that that is true.

Mr. McCUMBER. There are some soldiers who have been granted \$72 a month, but if the bill contains the names of widows who are granted \$72 a month my attention has not been called to it.

Mr. KING. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that I think they are cases in which there may be dependent children, and the payment would go to the widow.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I do not recall a case where such a sum would be given to the widow and dependent children. I think the Senator will find that he is in error about any widow receiving that; but I would not want to speak absolutely at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if I am in error I shall be very glad to make proper correction, and if this bill goes over until to-morrow for a final vote I will take the pains to look through the record very carefully to-night to verify the statement which I have made.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senator will allow us to get through to-day. I have tried to be accommodating to the Senator, so as to give him all the time necessary to look up matters pertaining to the bill; but realizing that to-morrow we will perhaps take all day upon the Armenian question, and this bill must pass the House after we get through, I hope the Senator will allow us to get a final vote on it this evening before adjournment. I do not think the Senator will find a case where \$72 is appropriated for a widow. There have been large sums granted to the widows of generals heretofore, and rather larger sums than \$72, but I do not think there are any of them in this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a limit must be set somewhere and the only thing that Congress may safely and prudently do is to halt all these cases at the threshold where they exceed the limit which has been established by general law. The purpose of the recent liberal general law was to relieve Congress of the flood of private pension bills which has inundated both branches of Congress for many years.

I have said, however, that in my opinion no pension bill that we may pass, regardless of the liberality and even prodigality of its terms, will consummate that result. There will be private pension bills by the hundreds and the thousands, as long as the Senator from North Dakota lives and very much longer, with the present views of many of the American people, and particularly of many politicians in the United States.

The bill contains 178 cases of pensions for adult sons and daughters of deceased pensioners. It is usual, and I ask the attention of Senators to this language in the committee report:

To state in such cases that no one survives who has title to pensions of soldier service—

the clear inference being that a pension under the act of Congress is to be considered as a sort of incorporeal hereditament, to pass down by succession to the soldiers' heirs. I have no doubt that after a while a pension will be considered as property which may pass by will, bequest, or devise. At any rate the impression seems to be now that it is personal property, a sort of incorporeal hereditament that may pass to the heirs of the deceased, and of course it is exempt from taxation.

There are about 27 miscellaneous cases, covering instances of soldiers whose military records show desertion, soldiers who had State service as differentiated from Federal service, and widows of Army officers who are claiming increases in pensions above those allowed by the Fuller Act.

Mr. DIAL. To illustrate the Senator's point, if the Senator will look on page 162 of the bill, line 16, and on top of the next page, he will see where it is provided that in case one dies another one's name shall be inserted, "Entail," I believe, is the legal phrase.

Mr. KING. That particular case had escaped my reading, but I have no doubt there will be found others in the bill who will be in the same situation. As I stated, it is regarded as a property right which may be transmitted.

Mr. DIAL. I am learning. I am young in the business, but I am "catching on."

Mr. KING. I wish to state to my friend that I am young in this matter, too. I have not been here long enough to become entirely familiar with the operations of the pension system.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator will allow me, of course I could not hear the colloquy between the two Senators, but I have made a little further investigation with reference to the Senator's statement based upon his belief that there were provisions for granting widows \$72 per month. I will say that there are none in the bill granted \$72 per month.

I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that two, who are widows of brigadier generals, have been allowed \$50 each. That is not in advance of what we have always allowed since I have been a member of the Committee on Pensions. A distinction has been made between widows of officers and widows of privates. I have taken the position that there should be no distinction, and that poverty meant exactly the same with one class as with the other, but I have been voted down upon that proposition by the Senate probably fifty times at least, and consequently we have allowed that as a rule. Two of them were allowed \$50 each. There are two or three other cases where there were two dependent children, where the \$30 had been allowed to the widow and \$10 each for dependent children, where they are dependent through either physical or mental disability. Those are the only cases, as I am informed, that even reach the \$50 limit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have just run through the bill hastily, and I find that that is the case.

Mr. KING. My recollection, though, is that there are some cases found—and these are the ones to which I alluded—where the widow and the children or the dependent children in the aggregate get \$72.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator is mistaken. The only two cases are where there have been two dependent children, and I think probably in both instances it will be found that they are crippled or mentally defective, where the widow has been allowed her regular \$30 and \$10 each for the dependent children.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator state the maximum amount which has been granted by special pension to a widow?

Mr. McCUMBER. In the case of one of the doctors, for instance, who allowed himself to be bitten by a mosquito infected with yellow fever and died as a result of that experimentation, the widow was granted more than \$50 a month. In all other cases we have never gone above \$50 a month in a report of the committee, whether of a private or of an officer, and in this particular bill there are none of them that are granted more than \$50 a month.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, my recollection is somewhat different from that of the Senator from North Dakota. I have not the time to examine in detail the bill before us or other pension measures in order to ascertain the largest amounts paid from time to time as pensions to widows.

This bill, as I have stated, is an omnibus bill carrying numerous private pension bills. I have indicated the classes into which these special claims fall. They are as follows:

1. Widows who married the ex-soldier since June 27, 1905, and whose husbands did not die from disability incurred in the service.

2. Soldiers who served less than 90 days in the Civil War and who incurred no disability in the service.

3. Widows of soldiers who served less than 30 days in the Civil War and who did not die from disability incurred in service.

4. Widows who have married and remarried one or more times since the death of the soldier under whom they claim.

5. Widows who at the time they claimed to have married the soldier were married and undivorced from other men and who were consequently guilty of bigamy.

6. Widows who claimed to have married the soldier at a time when he had another living undivorced wife, thus depriving them of the status of a wife.

7. Dependent sons and daughters of adult age of deceased soldiers who put forth a claim to succeed to the pension allowed their soldier father.

8. Deserters.

9. Widows of deserters.

10. Persons already on the pension roll who desire increase in pensions.

11. Persons who have been the beneficiaries of one, two, three, or more special acts of Congress.

None of these persons are entitled to pensions under existing law. Hence this method of making them beneficiaries of appropriations from the Federal Treasury. Notwithstanding the liberal pension laws enacted by Congress, special pension bills are pressed with constant and increasing force for affirmative action by Congress.

Before the Civil War very few private pension acts were passed by Congress. But beginning with the Forty-eighth Congress the number of pension bills presented and enacted into law showed a remarkable increase. During the years from 1861 to 1863, inclusive, there were only 12 special pension acts. During the Thirty-eighth Congress there were 27 private pension acts; during the Thirty-ninth Congress there were 138 such acts; during the Fortieth Congress the number was 275; the Forty-first Congress enacted 85; the Forty-second, Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, and Forty-seventh Congresses enacted an aggregate of 989 private pension bills. A large number of special acts passed in the Forty-eighth Congress, the number being 598. The Forty-ninth Congress passed 856 special pension bills and the Fiftieth Congress, 1,015. The Fifty-first increased the number to 1,388. There was a pronounced increase in the number of special acts during the Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, and Fifty-fifth Congresses, the aggregate being 1,408. With the Fifty-sixth Congress the number of special acts increased to 1,391. In the Fifty-seventh there were 2,171, and the Fifty-eighth Congress passed 3,358. The Fifty-ninth Congress enacted 6,030 special acts, and the Sixtieth, 6,600. During the Sixty-first Congress the high-water mark of special pension acts was reached, the number enacted totalling 9,649. In the Sixty-second Congress the number was 6,350, the Sixty-third enacted 5,061, and the Sixty-fourth, 5,885.

It must be apparent that special pension bills produce inequalities, result in favoritism, and exhibit rank discrimination.

President Cleveland vetoed during his first term 228 special acts. Of this number 175 were vetoed because the injuries were not received in military service and in the line of duty. Some vetoes rested upon the ground that the increases allowed over the general law were not justified, that in some cases where the basis of pension was alleged "dependency" there was no proof of the allegation, and other vetoes rested upon the ground that the applicants were deserters. In this bill and others which have become law Congress has abandoned all the grounds which were urged by President Cleveland for his refusal to give Executive approval to the same. By general law we pension those who received no injury and no disability either in the line of service or otherwise. We have broken down the safeguards erected by law to protect the Treasury against unjustifiable assaults. By special pension bills deserters are cared for; persons not dependents of those whose names were upon the military and naval branches of the United States are made recipients of grants from the Treas-

ury. Persons whose names were upon the rolls for less than 90 days receive consideration. Indeed, if there are any claims of persons who directly or indirectly were in any way connected with the Military or Naval Establishments of the Government during the Civil War who are not being pensioned, I am not aware of it.

Speaking of Mr. Cleveland's attitude upon pensions and of the evils of special pension acts, Prof. Glasson makes the following statement:

The determined stand of Mr. Cleveland against the abuse of special pension legislation had the effect of bringing to the attention of the country the recklessness of Congress in such matters and of securing for a time at least the more careful investigation of private pension claims in the congressional committees. Though the Republican Fifty-first Congress—the first of President Harrison's administration—passed 1,388 private pension acts, the party was committed to liberality in this direction by reason of its criticism of Mr. Cleveland's record. In the second half of the Harrison administration the House of Representatives was overwhelmingly Democratic and only 217 special pension acts were passed. In the four years of Cleveland's second administration 497 private pension bills became law. Mr. Cleveland's successors in the Presidency have not emulated his record of opposition to private pension bills. In the McKinley and Roosevelt administrations the number of such measures increased very largely, and in Mr. Taft's administration 15,999 pensions were granted by special act.

Congress is obviously not a suitable place for the investigation and just settlement of private pension claims. The pressure of general business is too great. There is little time for the detailed discussion of such matters on the floor of either House, and the recommendation of the Pension Committees must usually be followed without question if business is to be done. These committees can give no proper consideration to the thousands of claims presented. The passage of a certain number of pension claims upon plausible representations becomes practically a form of congressional patronage. Some Members are assiduous in seeking pensions for constituents to the exclusion of activities of a more public nature. It would be an improvement upon present methods if Congress should pass special pension bills only upon the recommendation of the Pension Bureau. The general pension laws are liberal, and the number of meritorious claims not within their scope must be very limited. The officers of the Pension Bureau have better facilities to learn the facts and form a just opinion in exceptional cases than Congress, and the history of the bureau will not convict it of bias against claimants. Under the present system there is unfair discrimination against the pensioners under the public laws by reason of the great number of increases secured by private bills for those who are able to gain the favor and aid of Senators and Representatives.

The same author submits a rather serious indictment against Congress. I express no opinion as to the justice of his criticism but submit that those who are familiar with pension legislation will have very decided views with regard to this matter.

In recent years the great majority of pensions granted by special act are in the nature of increases to rates in excess of the amounts provided for in the general laws. In such cases the claim is usually made that the circumstances of the particular applicant justify a rate higher than that normally paid. But it is fairly obvious that such increases are due more to the favor of Members of Congress than to any just and careful comparison of the merits and necessities of the applicants with those of other pensioners receiving the same allowance.

We are all familiar with the fact that a large number of special laws are for the purpose of correcting the military records of those who are shown upon the Government rolls to be deserters. There was never any thought about correcting the record upon the part of a great majority of those shown to be deserters until pensions were desired. Under the law where the records show dishonorable discharge or desertion no pension could be obtained. Accordingly, as stated, there have been for many years hundreds of special pension bills enacted to remove the charge of desertion or the record of dishonorable discharge. As soon as such acts were passed pensions were then paid to the beneficiaries.

Prof. Glasson, in speaking of the passage of private pension bills, states that:

On "pension day" there is commonly no quorum present. In the presence of a few Members, it has been a general practice to take up the pension bills reported by the committee and put them through the form of passage in a perfunctory manner and with remarkable speed. In some Congresses they have been passed at the rate of two or three a minute. Very few Members take the trouble to vote on such occasions or give any attention to the procedure, which is by general consent. Occasionally some disgusted southern Member, or some Member who has a grievance, stops the process temporarily by insisting on the presence of a quorum. Instead of passing a separate law granting each pension, Congress has in recent years followed the practice of including many grants of special pension as items in a sort of omnibus bill. Under this practice, if the President were disposed to veto some objectionable grants he could not do so without at the same time causing the failure of all the other pension provisions in the bill.

The author speaks of "no quorum" being present in the House on "pension days." During the consideration of pension bills in the Senate it is a rare occasion when more than a dozen Senators are present.

As I have stated the American people have always been desirous of dealing generously with the families of those whose lives were given for their country and those who were injured or received disabilities in the line of service. But that generous policy which met with such cordial approbation throughout the

country has been departed from and disability pensions are no longer important. The announced plan is to grant service pensions without regard to extent of service or the necessity for governmental gratuities. "Arrears" pension acts have been passed to supplement the general laws, and special acts have followed where the former legislation was inadequate to meet demands for Federal contributions.

A House executive document of the Fifty-first Congress, first session, reveals some of the evils which have grown up in the pension administration. For instance, one of the principal examiners in the Pension Bureau was receiving a salary of \$2,000 per year. He filed an application alleging "disability from malarial disease." An examination by the bureau's surgeon refuted his claim. Several years afterward his claim was granted and a pension allowed with arrears extending back to August, 1865, the amount paid being several thousand dollars.

It would be interesting to review in detail the legislation which has been enacted by Congress since the Civil War dealing with pensions, and the activities of the various organizations which have aided such legislation. I shall not, however, take the time of the Senate for that purpose, but will content myself with a hurried reference to these matters. The fact is, however, that local and national organizations have been potential in political parties and have influenced legislation. Demands have been made under threat of defeat of candidates for important political positions who did not signify their approval of policies projected by local organizations or representatives of those who were seeking general or special laws for pensions and governmental grants. In the House reports of the Forty-sixth Congress evidence is submitted which shows the methods employed to secure pension appropriations, which are discreditable to all concerned and constitute a dark page in the legislative experience of our country.

Mr. Bentley, when Commissioner of Pensions, directed attention to the fraudulent claims for pensions prosecuted under laws which had been secured through undue and improper influence. In his statement he uses this language:

As the law stood previous to the passage of the arrears act the temptation to fraud was very great, but since that act it is many times increased. Then the claims were comparatively few in which any considerable sum of money would be the immediate reward of a successfully prosecuted claim, but since that act every invalid claim allowed, as well as many of the other classes, will have in it from several hundred to several thousand dollars due the claimant at the first payment.

It is estimated by those best informed that there have been not less than \$2,000,000 paid out annually for fraudulent pensions. In my judgment, the estimate is below rather than above the actual amount.

With the temptation to the commission of fraud so greatly increased, and the road to the Treasury easy through ex parte proceedings, the consequences can easily be foretold. Not only will the people be taxed to pay an annual tribute to the unworthy, amounting to several millions of dollars, but with so many claims pending and still to be presented and the avenues to the two or three hundred persons, more or less, who are charged with their adjustment open for the approach of interested parties, it will be little less than a miracle if extensive official corruption does not follow.

Speaking of the pension act of 1890, Prof. Glasson states that under it pensions might be received by persons who were receiving handsome incomes from their services as skilled workers, or as lawyers, physicians, public officials, business men, and bankers. While the act declared that pensions were to be granted to ex-soldiers for incapacity to perform "manual" labor, it was construed to grant pensions to persons in the lines of employment just referred to.

Pensions were provided for the highly paid but rheumatic lawyer, for the prosperous business man hurt in a street accident, for the ex-soldier public official with heart disease, and for the mechanic who had lost a hand in an industrial accident. It was well to have these ills of life provided for, but questionable whether military reasons required the provision to be made at the expense of the general taxpayer.

There was no distinction in granting pensions to those in affluent circumstances and the poor.

The act was not a national gratuity or dignified form of relief for indigent and infirm veterans, as contemplated by the advocates of a dependent pension bill, for it pensioned alike the rich and the poor, the prosperous and the unprosperous. It was not a reward for long and meritorious service in the Army, for it treated the three through the whole war. It was not a compensation for injuries and disease contracted in the camp or on the battle field, for it pensioned for mental and physical disabilities whenever and wherever incurred, except those resulting from vicious habits.

Under this act this author states that widows' pensions were granted regardless of the cause of the husband's death and to—widows who were unborn, or merely small children when the Civil War ended. * * * This provision especially benefited young women who, long years after the war, married middle-aged or elderly ex-soldiers. It is hard to see why such widows and children born of such marriages are more deserving of national aid than the dependent widows and children of other loyal citizens who were never called upon to perform military service. The experience of the Pension Bureau has also

been that the desire on the part of young widows to retain pensions has frequently resulted in immoral alliances rather than in remarriages which would cause the loss of the pensions.

Speaking of this act and the circumstances of its passage, Prof. Glasson says:

It was a high bid for the political support of the 450,000 Grand Army of the Republic men and other ex-soldiers, with both the Republican and Democratic parties bidding. To the professional politician it was a way to spend the surplus, which appealed to the sentiment of the people and which also promised to produce votes for the candidates of the party. Undoubtedly in passing the act of 1890 the Republican Congress and national administration attached strongly to that party the great majority of the Grand Army of the Republic voters.

It was estimated that this act before it was superseded in 1907 cost the country over a billion dollars. Mr. H. Clay Evans, who was Commissioner of Pensions under the McKinley administration, in reporting the practices of the Pension Bureau in administering the act of 1890, said:

I am free to say that the practice has never been to inquire into the capacity of the claimant to earn a support. The prosperous have been pensioned alike, on application, with the less fortunate, plainly on showing disabilities or disease, without any reference to the claimant's wealth or capacity to earn a support.

I referred to the powerful influences which have secured passage of pension legislation. Gen. SHERWOOD, who has been in the House for many years, stated:

You can get anyone to vote for any pension bill you want in any legislature in the North, because the members do not dare to vote against it. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., 2d sess., pt. 1, 127.)

Representative Dies, of Texas, indicated a concurrence in this view when he said:

I am a party Democrat and I want my party to win, but the naked truth is that the Democratic Party is just as cowardly on this pension question as ever the Republican Party dared to be. * * * Every man who votes for this pension increase indirectly votes against lower tariff taxation.

The Sherwood bill was passed in the House by a vote of 229 to 93. This measure, it is estimated, has increased the burdens to the Government of more than \$75,000,000 per annum. As I recall, the distinguished chairman of the Senate committee [Mr. McCUMBER] stated that the Sherwood bill would involve an annual increase of more than \$75,000,000 and that a bond issue might be required to meet the obligations which it created.

Perhaps the reluctance of members of the National Legislature to oppose pension bills may be in part understood when it is known that on the 30th day of June, 1912, there were more than 846,000 persons on the Federal pension list.

That those receiving pensions from the Federal Government constitute a powerful force in the various States is evident when it is recalled that in 1900 there were in the District of Columbia 1 pensioner for every 22 of the population. In Maine there was 1 pensioner to every 35 of population. In Kansas it was 1 to every 36; in Indiana 1 to every 37; in Ohio 1 to every 40. Ohio in that year received in Federal pensions \$15,171,000 and Indiana received \$10,339,000. The population of the United States in 1900 was 75,994,575, and the number of Federal pensioners in the country was 988,446.

The Sherwood bill as it passed the House was greatly modified in the Senate. Indeed, a substitute was presented by the Senator from North Dakota which passed by an overwhelming majority and the conferees made some slight changes and accepted the Senate bill; it became a law on May 11, 1912. This act granted pensions to all whose names had been upon the roll for 90 days or more in the Civil War and were 62 years of age or over. It further provided that pensions should be paid without regard to age or length of service to persons who served in the Civil War and were honorably discharged and who were disabled from performing manual labor as the result of wounds received in battle or in the line of duty or as the result of disease or other causes incurred in the line of duty. Within a very short time after the passage of this act more than 4,600 applications for relief under it were filed in the Pension Bureau. This act superseded the service and age pension act of 1907, and within a short time all who were receiving pensions under that act were obtaining the benefits of the act of 1912. Of course, the charge upon the Treasury greatly increased, and in 1914, \$172,409,600 was paid as pensions. Another pension bill was passed in September, 1916, under which the list of pensioners was greatly increased. Under its provisions a young woman who married an ex-soldier 40 years after the Civil War may be pensioned for life. She may be married a number of times after the death of the ex-soldier, but whenever she is a widow, regardless of her wealth or income, she is to be pensioned. At the end of the fiscal year of 1917 more than \$2,230,000,000 had been paid to those whose names had been upon the rolls of the military and naval branches of the Government, and to their widows and their relatives, in cases where there had been no proof of disability, or injury, or any disability

contracted while in the military service. In addition to this amount the cost of administering the law amounted to approximately \$133,000,000.

Pensions have been granted without discrimination between the poor and the prosperous, and until 1912, as I recall, there was no recognition given to long military service. The 90-day men received the same pension as the soldier who served during the entire war.

The pension system and its administration has been criticized by Prof. Glasson in these words:

The administration of the laws has also been hampered by political pressure and interference. Some administrations have been vigilant to protect the Treasury from imposition and fraud; others have been "liberal" to the point of facilitating the pensioning of persons whose claims were of doubtful merit or supported by false representations. Under the pension laws, imposition has often been easy and the fruits of dishonesty great. The provisions granting pensions for disabilities not of service origin have stimulated dependence among the veterans and tended to place the service of the citizen to the State upon too mercenary a basis.

I have here a number of articles written by Burton J. Hendrick, which were reported in the World's Work, dealing with what he denominates "pork-barrel pensions." Attention is called upon the title page of the pamphlet containing the articles to the fact that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, there were paid for pensions alone more than \$172,000,000, and that that amount combined with the expenditures for the Army and Navy gave a military budget of more than \$466,000,000. We have been accustomed to speak of Prussian militarism, and yet the German Empire in the year 1913 expended only \$491,000,000 for pensions and for its military and naval operations. In 1913 our national expenditures, exclusive of the Postal Service, were less than \$749,000,000; but we spent more than one-half of our income on our military budget.

In these articles Mr. Burton exposes the methods by which pensions were obtained, describes how deserters were made into heroes by statute, and the methods by which pernicious private pension bills were enacted into law. These articles are a scathing indictment of the work of Congress and the sinister and improper influences which have procured legislation dealing with pensions. In a former speech I have referred to these articles and will therefore make no further reference to them at this time.

The Senator from North Dakota is anxious to have this bill passed to-night. I have no doubt his views are shared by other Senators; at least, by those who are in attendance. The great majority of the Members of this body manifest no interest in the measure, assuming, I presume, that it will encounter no successful opposition and will speedily receive the approval of the Senate. Let me repeat what I said when the so-called Sells bill was before the Senate: It is impossible to defeat any pension bill. Indeed, it is impossible to accomplish the defeat of any appropriation bill. Experience has demonstrated that Congress is impotent to cope with organizations formed in our country for the purpose of obtaining contributions from the Treasury of the United States. No matter the character of the appropriations sought, whether worthy or unworthy, whether meritorious or devoid of merit, if the organizations back of it are powerful enough and continue their efforts and pressure with sufficient zeal and pertinacity, they will in the end secure what they ask.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a moment on that proposition?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. It became my duty on Saturday to lay before the Senate the terms of an understanding between the Literary Digest and the postal employees' unions of the country, one of the most sordid arrangements for securing aid from the Treasury that has thus far come under my notice. Not a single paper in the United States, so far as I have been able to ascertain, up to this time has said a word about it; not a word. The great papers of New York yesterday morning and the Washington and other papers which I have examined all were as silent as the grave upon the proposition, and largely, I presume, because they expect to be in time the beneficiaries of the agreement, if it shall succeed to the extent of repealing the present rates of second-class postage.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I regret to learn of the incident to which the Senator refers. Revelations of this kind are very depressing to me and I believe they must similarly affect all patriotic Americans. My information has been to the effect that the postal employees were not adequately paid. I have indicated to a number of them that I would support a measure that gave them relief and a just and fair compensation.

If it be a fact that the employees of the Government adopted methods referred to by the Senator from Colorado a few days ago, for the purpose of securing the passage of legislation, I

believe that it was improper and that it should occasion profound regret throughout the country. And if the magazine to which the Senator refers sought by the advocacy of the legislation to secure financial advantage in the form of reduced postal rates, its conduct was most reprehensible and calls for condemnation from all honest men. If other newspapers were parties to any arrangement by the terms of which they were to advocate legislation for the relief of postal employees, in consideration of which the latter were to use their influence to procure legislation beneficial to the newspapers, they have been guilty of an immoral act for which there is no extenuation. If the facts are as stated by the Senator from Colorado, it makes an ugly page in contemporaneous history.

The American people have been justly proud of the record made by the press of this country. In the pre-Revolutionary days as well as since the liberties of the American people have been ably defended by the press. Some of the greatest men of our country have been editors, and their pens have been dipped in fire, as they have led the people in mighty contests to secure political reforms, and moral victories. The press has been the bulwark of American freedom. We pronounce with reverence the illustrious names of Franklin and Greely and Bowles and Dana and Grady and Watterson and the hundreds of others who have made glorious the press of our land, and who with knightly courage have borne the torch of intellectual liberty and social justice to guide the people in the days of peace as well as in the hours of national peril.

We remember the words of Jefferson when he stated that he would rather live in a country that had no government and had newspapers, than in one where there was a government but no newspapers. He recognized the value of the press and regarded it as indispensable to liberty and progress. Unfortunately some newspapers exist only to advocate special interests or class legislation. Others are the personal organs of individuals who seek political preferment or have financial or other interests which they desire to protect. There are newspapers which are partisan and bigoted, and only interested in the success of political organizations. The merits of political questions or the ethical principles involved are wholly without interest and receive no consideration.

Fortunate indeed is the country which possesses an independent and honest press. As long as we have men to lead us who have courage and sincerity and honesty, men who love their country and have an abiding faith in its destiny, and who believe that justice and righteousness will ultimately prevail throughout the world, our country will be safe. The American people desire the truth. They want good government. They have faith in the political principles upon which this Nation is founded. They may be misled for a time and be betrayed in an evil hour, and their feet may depart under the direction of false leaders from the paths of safety, but ultimately they will find themselves, and guided by the spirit of Washington and Jefferson and those who have preserved and glorified this Nation, they will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and rescue it and the institutions of our land from all enemies, whether foreign or domestic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to amend the amendment by striking out all of those paragraphs which give or grant pensions to men who served less than 90 days.

There are 65 in this category. I presume I will have to state them for the Record, though it will take some time, I will say to the Senator, to call attention to each of the items.

Mr. McCUMBER. I presume, Mr. President, that a motion could be made to strike out all of those items, and that then the Secretary, with the assistance of the Senator from Utah, could determine which ones fall under the motion. We could dispose of the question very much quicker, of course, in that way.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that I have numbered each item in the bill, treating it as a paragraph, the last item being 680.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah may send his amendment to the desk in order that it may appear in the Record.

Mr. KING. I will state that the items I move to strike out are numbered 6, 7, 15, 48, 84, 94, 101, 109, 117, 118, 127, 140, 151, 160, 163, 183, 198, 203, 212, 219, 225, 251, 252, 265, 272, 276, 289, 302, 313, 318, 326, 329, 335, 337, 338, 353, 360, 361, 362, 364, 368, 370, 420, 441, 472, 475, 480, 482, 518, 531, 542, 549, 557, 564, 574, 584, 597, 603, 605, 607, and 628.

Those are the numbers, Mr. President, which constitute the amendment as I have indicated them upon the printed bill

now upon the desk of the Secretary and upon the desks of Senators, so that it is very easy by looking at the copy of the bill which I have, and which I have numbered, to determine the items which are embraced in my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Senator may present his amendment to the committee amendment as he has thus indicated it.

Mr. KING. Let me state, in order that Senators may understand what my motion is, that the present law fixes 90 days as the minimum service to entitle a soldier to a service pension. There are 65 items in the bill in which pensions are granted for a service of less than 90 days. My motion is to strike from the bill all of those items granting pensions for less than 90 days' service, because it proposes a departure from existing law; it is unfair and discriminatory, and it will establish a precedent which in the end will be utilized to secure service pensions for everyone who was enrolled in the Army or the Navy, though he served but for one day or for one hour, if his name appeared upon the rolls. That will be the result of the enactment of this bill, and it seems to me that no one can defend a departure from the existing law when the precedent to be established portends such serious consequences.

The amendment of Mr. KING to the amendment reported by the committee is as follows:

On page 59, after line 21, to strike out:
"The name of Henry Seebers, late unassigned, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month."

At the top of page 60, to strike out:
"The name of Nason B. Cunningham, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month."

On page 61, after line 14, to strike out:
"The name of John I. Amy, late of unassigned Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 67, after line 19, to strike out:
"The name of Mary J. Bowen, widow of Russell Bowen, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 75, after line 5, to strike out:
"The name of Harriet M. Godfrey, widow of Edwin J. Godfrey, late of Company B, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 77, after line 8, to strike out:
"The name of Olive M. Kelly, widow of George Kelly, late of Company C, Eighty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 78, after line 13, to strike out:
"The name of Fred Hawk, late of Company C, Fifty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 79, after line 21, to strike out:
"The name of Mary Sullivan, widow of Cornelius Sullivan, late of Company L, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 81, after line 15, to strike out:
"The name of David Rushion, enrolled as David Rushton, late of Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 19, to strike out:
"The name of George Bowen, late of Second Battery, Vermont Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 83, after line 4, to strike out:
"The name of Charles Waide, late of Company I, Thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 85, after line 9, to strike out:
"The name of Lillian M. Evans, widow of William W. Evans, late of Company C, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 87, after line 8, to strike out:
"The name of Harriet S. Parker, widow of Charles Parker, late of Company G, Twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 88, after line 20, to strike out:
"The name of Gideon C. Lewis, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 89, after line 6, to strike out:
"The name of Joseph Ford, late of Company G, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month, the same to be paid him without deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments of pension."

On page 92, after line 18, to strike out:
"The name of Rhoda A. Beatty, widow of Samuel T. Beatty, late of Company H, Thirty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Emergency Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 95, after line 12 to strike out:
"The name of Samuel W. Hayden, late private Sixth Independent Company Ohio Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

On page 96, after line 11, to strike out:
"The name of Louisa E. Prickett, widow of William W. Prickett, late of Company I, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 98, to strike out:
"The name of Margaret A. Davis, widow of Wilson H. Davis, late of Company F, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 99, after line 4, to strike out:
"The name of Elizabeth Morand, widow of Alfred L. S. Morand, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 100, after line 4, to strike out:
 "The name of Margaret W. Mitchell, widow of Walter P. Mitchell, late of Capt. Thatcher's independent company, Pettis County Missouri Home Guards, and Company C, Fortieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 104, after line 21, to strike out:
 "The name of Sarah Cox, widow of James L. Cox, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 105, to strike out:
 "The name of Mary J. Martin, widow of William S. Martin, late of Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 107, after line 2, to strike out:
 "The name of Louisa C. Southerland, widow of James C. Southerland, late of Capt. Gilbreath's company of Alabama Scouts and Guides, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 108, after line 7, to strike out:
 "The name of F. W. Gerding, late special agent, Ordnance Department, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 109, to strike out:
 "The name of Mollie Reck, widow of William L. Reck, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 111, after line 11, to strike out:
 "The name of Jacob H. Martz, late of Company D, Second Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 113, after line 16, to strike out:
 "The name of Jane Jadwin, widow of Benjamin Jadwin, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Twenty-second Independent Battery, Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 115, after line 14, to strike out:
 "The name of Sarah M. Doan, widow of William F. Doan, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 117 to strike out:
 "The name of Sylvia Hitchcock, widow of George A. Hitchcock, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 118, after line 9, to strike out:
 "The name of Robert C. Pollock, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 20, to strike out:
 "The name of Phebe Morgan, widow of John H. Morgan, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 119, after line 22, to strike out:
 "The name of Eliza Gratz, widow of Paul H. Gratz, alias Paul F. Ochs, late of Company A, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 120, after line 7, to strike out:
 "The name of Richard M. Johnson, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 11, to strike out:
 "The name of Anna D. Abel, widow of William A. Abel, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 123, to strike out:
 "The name of Jennie D. Matteson, former widow of David Johns, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 124, after line 4, to strike out:
 "The name of Delilah J. Feist, widow of Albert Feist, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 8, to strike out:
 "The name of Ephraim Huff, widow of John A. Huff, late of the U. S. steamship *Tyler*, Western Gunboat Flotilla, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 12, to strike out:
 "The name of Jimima Trueax, widow of George M. Trueax, late of Company A, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On the same page, after line 20, to strike out:
 "The name of William Blades, late of Company B, Permanent Battalion, Camp Russell, Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and unassigned, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 125, after line 12, to strike out:
 "The name of Sarah Virginia Pollard, widow of Allison W. Pollard, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 125, after line 20, to strike out:
 "The name of Adam Mille, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 136, to strike out:
 "The name of George W. Burk, late of Company F, Fifty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 140, after line 6, to strike out:
 "The name of Jane McMahon, widow of Matthew McMahon, late of Company D, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 145, after line 13, to strike out:
 "The name of Cora B. Kelley, widow of James Kelley, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

At the top of page 146, to strike out:
 "The name of Israel Boyer, alias George Johnson, late of Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 146, after line 22, to strike out:
 "The name of Samuel Pryor, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 147, after line 4, to strike out:
 "The name of Peter Boyd, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 154, after line 8, to strike out:
 "The name of Mary E. Leroy, widow of Fred, alias Frederick, Leroy, late of Company E, First Regiment United States Reserve Corps, Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 156, after line 17, to strike out:
 "The name of Mary Werner, widow of Adam Werner, late of Captain Knapp's company, Seventh Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 158, after line 12, to strike out:
 "The name of Susan H. Orr, widow of Charles W. Orr, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Volunteer Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 159, after line 17, to strike out:
 "The name of Sarah Keys, widow of William T. Keys, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 161, after line 5, to strike out:
 "The name of Louisa R. Bechtel, widow of Morgan S. Bechtel, late of Company G, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 163, after line 3, to strike out:
 "The name of Abigail Merriman, widow of Henry L. Merriman, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 165, after line 11, to strike out:
 "The name of Ellen S. Vestile, widow of George W. Vestile, late of Captain Bassett's independent company, Ninth Regiment Indiana Legion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 167, after line 13, to strike out:
 "The name of Joseph E. Dearborn, late unassigned, Tenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

On page 169, after line 19, to strike out:
 "The name of Alice Hingson, widow of Thomas J. Hingson, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving and \$6 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Thomas J. Hingson until they reach the age of 16 years."

On page 170, after line 22, to strike out:
 "The name of Martha A. Robbins, widow of Leander C. Robbins, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 171, after line 6, to strike out:
 "The name of William N. Ingersoll, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month."

On page 171, after line 12, to strike out:
 "The name of Elizabeth Ross, widow of Adam Ross, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

On page 175, after line 3, to strike out:
 "The name of Emilie Hartley, widow of James R. Hartley, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall boil down what I desire to say in answer to the argument of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] in not to exceed three minutes of time. I can give a reason which the Senator undoubtedly has not fully considered why in certain cases it is perfectly proper to include in a special pension bill those who may have served less than 90 days.

I wish first to present to the Senate facts showing exactly what this pension bill involves. It will be recalled that the other House has been passing private pensions since last September. Those bills have come to the Senate, but we have held them in abeyance until, as the Senator from Utah has suggested, they embrace about 2,900 names, or about 3,000 altogether in the House bills. Most of those bills were passed in the House before the Fuller bill was presented to the Senate and before the Fuller bill was even passed by the House. Then, there were a number of Senate bills. It was quite certain that the Fuller bill would pass both Houses, and I therefore, on my own motion, asked that all of the special pension bills be laid aside until we should have disposed of the Fuller bill. Having disposed of the Fuller bill, we then took one of the House bills and amended it by striking out all after the enacting clause, and then inserting in lieu of the portion stricken out the names of all of those out of the three thousand or thirty-five hundred in both Senate and House bills who would not be taken care of by the Fuller pension bill. So we have practically a year of pension bills all crowded into this single omnibus bill. It is not, however, nearly as vital, I think, as the Senator from Utah would indicate it to be.

As the Senator has stated, the bill contains the names of 680 pensioners, and 379 of those cases provide for a pension of \$30 a month for widows who otherwise would not be pensionable under the general law. In 160 cases a pension of \$20 per month has been recommended. Those items are intended to pension helpless and dependent children of soldiers independently of the parents; that is, where the beneficiaries are orphans.

In 86 cases a pension of \$35 per month is recommended. Those cases cover widows who are now receiving \$30 per month under existing laws, who are over the age of 75 years, and require the constant aid and attention of other persons.

In 38 cases \$40 per month is granted. Those items cover the cases of widows who have one minor child to support; and I think a careful examination will elicit the fact that the child is perfectly helpless, either mentally or physically. Where the case simply involves a minor child, of course, the extra pension of \$10 a month will cease when the child becomes 16 years of age.

There are 17 cases where \$50 per month is granted. This class covers the cases of widows who have two minor children to support, and also a few soldiers who can not get that rate under existing law.

There are four cases where \$72 per month is granted. They are cases in which the soldier rendered long and faithful service and is now absolutely helpless and requires the constant aid and attention of another person, as, for instance, where the soldier is paralyzed. I recall one case among this number where there is not only complete paralysis but also where the soldier is dying from stomach cancer and can not last longer than a few weeks.

There are two cases where \$24 a month is granted.

After all these cases are included, what is the proposed legislation going to cost the Government? If all the beneficiaries live for a single year the amount added to the pension roll will be \$182,760, which is rather a mere bagatelle compared with the sums which we are almost daily voting; but as, according to present statistics, about one-half of those to whom we grant private pensions die within one year, the total expenditure involved will not amount to more than half the sum I have named. So the Treasury is not going to be looted to any great extent by taking care of the old soldiers and their widows covered by the pending bill.

Mr. President, I wish now to answer very briefly the objections upon which the pending motion of the Senator from Utah is based. He says that it has been the inflexible rule to grant no pension to a soldier who has served for less than 90 days. In that the Senator is mistaken. If a soldier incurred a disability, although he may not have served three days, he has a pensionable status. If the Senator will carefully examine the items included in this bill, I think he will find, if not in every instance, at least in nearly every instance, that the cases covered are those of soldiers who have a pensionable status, although they served less than 90 days, but are not pensionable at the rate provided in the various items. Suppose a soldier 65 or 68 years of age who served 60 days was wounded in battle, and has been drawing a pension during all of the ensuing time for that wound, but his pension will not be \$72 per month. Now, let us suppose that he is suffering from total paralysis and needs the constant aid and attention of another person. In that event he is granted an additional pension because of the necessity for aid and attention. His case is not covered by the general law, but it will be covered by this bill. So the objection which the Senator from Utah urges, that these items should not be included in the pending bill, because they relate to soldiers who were not in battle, did not incur any disability, and served for less than 90 days, is untenable and arises from an erroneous understanding of the cases.

Now, in regard to the widows, I think if the Senator will examine the record very carefully he will find that the facts justify the recommendation of the committee. Take, for instance, the case of a man who was a good soldier, who fought for the preservation of the life of his country, and because of whose valor and suffering we have a United States of America to-day. He was possibly married during the war or very shortly thereafter. He died a few years ago, leaving a widow old and helpless. She was a pretty good wife to the soldier, possibly during many long years, perhaps even during the time of his service. Being helpless and old, she did not want to go to the poorhouse, but felt that, perhaps, by marrying some man he might give her a good home, so that she could live the remainder of her allotted life in peace. To get married after 75 years of age, or even 60, I think is hardly the thing to do; but old ladies are liable to make mistakes, and I am willing to forgive them under the circumstances if they did not make a good marriage after they were 60 or 70 years of age, and I am ready, in honor of this old soldier who kept the flag of his country flying through the dark days of 1861 to 1865, to take her back and give her a pension, even though she married once or twice or thrice. Of course, she was foolish to do so, but when people get in their dotage I forgive them a great many things that I would not forgive if they were young people in the vigor of manhood and womanhood; and a close examination of these cases will show that we have not been unjust in granting the little stipend to a widow who made a mistake in thinking that she could get married after

she got to be an old woman and that the marriage would be a happy and a pleasant one. She made a mistake; maybe she got a divorce; and if she did, and is now penniless, I want to help her out because of the love and the gratitude I have toward the old soldier who saved this country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCUMBER. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Do I understand from the Senator that all of the widows who are cared for in this bill are over 70 or 75 years of age?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; some of them are younger and were foolish enough to get married when they were 60 years of age.

Mr. THOMAS. Some were younger than that.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; perhaps some of them were 55 years of age. There were not many of them. They are mostly old women, however, and each case was considered upon its own merits.

Now, we are not making an exception to the rule. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the law to-day is that it does not make any difference whether the widow is married once or thrice or a dozen times; upon the death of her last spouse, or upon her divorce, she is put back upon the pension roll under the present law. Therefore we are not changing that law.

Mr. THOMAS. That was the act of 1916.

Mr. McCUMBER. And the act of 1920, the Fuller bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; the act of 1916, just before the last presidential election.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; and reiterated in the act of 1920. I was not in favor of it myself.

Now the case of the undivorced: A great many of these cases—I will not say how many now—are put upon the pension roll because they could not secure their pensions at the department. Why? Because the records showed that the husband had been married once, and they could not go back and find the proof that he got a divorce. Possibly the woman had lived with that soldier for 20 or 30 or 40 years, believing that he was divorced, and probably he was divorced in some court in which the record is gone, or he thought he was divorced, at least, and she thought the same thing. You can not always prove those cases. Some of them had trouble in proving the fact that they were the widows of the soldiers. They could not get a certificate. They were married by some justice of the peace, possibly, out in the country, and it was hard to get the records; the witnesses had died, and they had trouble in establishing even the marriage, and their continuance of living with the soldier long enough at least to call it a common-law marriage.

Those cases have been carefully considered; and remember that we have cut out the vast majority of the cases that came to us. The Senator thinks we have been liberal, and I agree that more than 10,000 bills have been introduced in the House, and we have cut them down finally, both House and Senate bills, to 682.

There are a few of those cases, I think, where the marriage was later than 1905. There was some good reason in each instance why the committees of both the House and the Senate thought that we ought to grant a pension, even though it reached beyond 1905, in these special cases. Remember, the House passed the bill fixing the year at 1915. We cut it down to 1905, the old law, I will admit, under the expectation that probably we would agree on about 1910 in conference; but the House did not want to take the chance of a conference on the bill, fearing that they might not get it through in time. Therefore they accepted the amendment, the chairman of the committee stating that they would want to take care by special bill of those cases that would come in at least under 1910. I think that should be changed, as the Senator says, by a general law; but we have not followed that rule altogether in our past legislation. We have considered each case, and if the marriage ran but a short time beyond the period fixed by law we have sometimes overlooked it and granted a pension because of some other merits that were in the case.

Mr. President, I think this covers generally the objections that have been urged.

RECESS.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning.

There being no objection, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 1, 1920, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 24), 1920.

SOLICITOR GENERAL.

William L. Frierson, of Chattanooga, Tenn. (now Assistant Attorney General), to be Solicitor General, vice Alexander C. King, appointed circuit judge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 31, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, whose judgments are true and righteous altogether, we stand in Thy sacred presence on this holy day, with gratitude welling up in our hearts for Thee and for the brave and gallant men who gave the last full measure of devotion to the Nation they loved and which every true American loves, that it should not perish from the earth.

We bless Thee that patriotism lives and will weave garlands of flowers, tablets of roses, to strew over the silent graves of those whose tents are pitched on "fame's eternal camping ground." Long may their memories live and their deeds inspire our newborn sons with patriotic fire for liberty, freedom, justice, and truth.

So may our Government live and bear the fruits of freedom while time shall last and the Stars and Stripes of Old Glory live on forever. In the spirit of the World's Greatest Patriot who died a martyr to truth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12272. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and

H. R. 12775. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice.

ADDRESS ON LINCOLN AND GRANT.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor yesterday to deliver an address on Lincoln and Grant in the rotunda of the Capitol. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks by publishing that address in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address that he gave yesterday in the rotunda of the Capitol on Lincoln and Grant. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report on the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 13108. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. MADDEN. Some time since I received a letter from a man in Chicago by the name of Margolis, making charges against the Public Health Service. The result was an investigation. I have the report of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and I would like to have it go into the RECORD. I would also like to explain the situation.

Mr. BLANTON. Is this Margolis the bolshevistic, anarchistic Margolis of Pittsburgh?

Mr. MADDEN. No; he is a Chicago man. As a matter of justice to the Public Health Service, I want to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] does not seem to be on his job and has not been for a week. There are thousands of letters like this that they wish to put in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. This is a report from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Mr. GARNER. Yes; and I make a complaint to the Surgeon General, and he writes me a letter, and, as I say, there are thousands. I am not going to object to this one, but I do call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming and the gentleman from Massachusetts that if we put one of these in the RECORD, everybody else will want to put his letter in.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say that I think it would be unfair to the office of the Surgeon General not to give a history of this investigation, in view of the charges that have been made.

Mr. GARNER. What investigation by the Public Health Service? Nothing but a letter.

Mr. MADDEN. It was an investigation made by the Surgeon General's office, and this is a report of the result of that investigation.

Mr. GARNER. When did this man prefer the charges?

Mr. MADDEN. A couple of months ago.

Mr. GARNER. How did he make the charges?

Mr. MADDEN. By letter. It was taken up on the floor of the House, and they are published in the RECORD. I think it is only fair to have the other side of the case appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a man by the name of H. J. Margolis, of Chicago, representing himself as associated with an organization called the Service Men's Union of Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines Organization, wrote a letter complaining about the treatment of ex-service men in the hospitals under the conduct of the Public Health Service, and he cited specific cases of injustice done to those men.

After I took that matter up on the floor of the House the succeeding day the Surgeon General called at my office. He said that he would make a thorough investigation. He appointed his chief inspector, who went to the hospital referred to, made a thorough investigation of each case complained of, and the report of his findings is embodied in the paper I hold in my hand.

I wish to say in this connection that the result of the investigation seems to indicate that the charges made by Mr. Margolis were not well founded, and it is because of my desire to do justice to the office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that I rise in my place this morning and say what I have said and ask unanimous consent that the report of the Surgeon General's office in respect to all these cases may be made a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to insert the report in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

THE SURGEON GENERAL,
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, May 11, 1920.

THE SURGEON GENERAL,
United States Public Health Service, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to submit the following synopsis from a report made by Senior Surg. (Reserve) Terriberry, the full report being now in your hands, on the letter of H. J. Margolis, of Chicago, dated April 1, and quoted by Hon. MARTIN B. MADDEN and published as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 6, 1920.

Every individual who was quoted as having been the victim of neglect or ill-treatment was interviewed, together with many witnesses who were disinterested, and Senior Surg. Terriberry elicited the following facts:

1. The Margolis letter is written so as to produce an impression discrediting the service and its officers in Chicago, and at the same time to escape legal responsibility for statements not in accordance with fact. Except in the case of Hyman Margolis, the charges are indirect and based on hearsay.

2. Francisco Isaia, alleged discharged from hospital penniless and unable to work, has been receiving compensation, including back pay, at \$80 per month since his discharge from the Army; now in a period of quiescence while awaiting a secondary operation; was unable to get light work, therefore remained in hospital and says he has no complaint to make against the service or any of its officers.

3. Joseph Romano, alleged to be discharged after a serious operation and before cured; suffered from a sprained thumb. War Risk Bureau unable to connect this entry with his military service, but he was operated on March 18; made a normal recovery and was discharged on April 1; was not in receipt of compensation because he was not entitled to it. The operation was for varicocele, not in line of duty.

4. William E. Schmidt, charged to be the victim of professional malpractice; shown on investigation to be the victim of delayed development and hypochondriasis; was carefully examined and carefully treated; even has his meals served to him in bed, although there was nothing the matter with him except his congenital deficiencies. Dr. Hamill, the expert in this line, testified that he was a man of retarded development and constitutional mental inferiority.

5. Arthur Shoven, alleged to be the victim of malpractice in that his wounds after operation were not properly dressed, says himself that he has never made a statement such as was attributed to him by Margolis; that he received constant attention from the time he entered the hospital, and has no complaint to make against the hospital or anybody in it.

6. Flory S. Flowers, alleged to be the victim of neglect by the medical officers; shown in Army records to have been treated for bladder trouble not in line of duty; no evidence obtained to date showing this man's present ailment connected with his service in the Army; was found to be suffering from cataract of the right eye, which he claimed resulted from a boxing match in the service. There was unavoidable delay of two months in securing glasses not chargeable to the marine hospital authority, as glasses are provided by the War Risk Insurance Bureau under the law, and this man is not a beneficiary. He is now employed in the hospital itself as an orderly, being paid \$60 per month and his maintenance; prima facie evidence that he has no cause of complaint.

7. Joe Vacarro, charged to have been neglected by the medical officers. No evidence to show that his disability, which he claimed was from trouble with his back, had any connection with his Army service, and he is therefore not in receipt of compensation. While at the hospital he received treatment for his eyes, his tonsils, and for venereal disease, and is recorded as cured; testifies that he has "always been nervous," and is manifestly a case of neurasthenia. He is also employed as an orderly, doing light work, and is receiving \$60 per month as an employee.

8. Hyman Margolis, alleged victim of professional maltreatment and premature discharge from the hospital, with neglect on the part of medical officers, has nothing to substantiate his claim that his ailments are in any way connected with his Army service. Dr. Riddlon and Dr. Ryerson, both famous surgeons, testify that they do not believe his bunions were caused by standing in mud and water, but by shoes and stockings either too tight or too short. He is not in receipt of compensation for the reason above alleged, and, although this matter is outside the responsibilities of the Public Health Service, it is only fair to state it. Although not entitled, he was nevertheless operated on by Dr. Ryerson on February 20, and made an uneventful recovery, and was supplied a pair of shoes by the Red Cross, which he refused to wear. He refused to leave the ward and go to the dining room for his meals, claiming inability to do so, although able to go out of the hospital on pass at this time for two days. He was not discharged until after examination by Dr. John Riddlon, orthopedic consultant, who testified that he examined Margolis on March 29, and found the incision healed, and advised Margolis to use his feet, as in private practice such cases are made to walk much earlier than was Margolis as a part of the treatment itself. Margolis was ordered to be discharged from the hospital, and refused to go, and was finally ejected by the police.

9. H. J. Margolis, the brother of this man and the writer of the complaint, was called into the investigation, and testimony shows that he said he would have "Cobb (J. O. Cobb, the commanding officer) thrown out on his neck, and everybody else in the hospital, and would tear the place up from roof to cellar." He said he represented a soldier and sailor organization and various newspapers, and that his influence would enable him to carry out his threats. Testimony shows that Margolis was sufficiently cured at the time of his ejection to warrant action in discharging him without harm to himself or anybody else.

10. Charles H. Becker, alleged to have been discharged from the hospital, to his harm and detriment. This case was investigated by myself on March 3, 1920, and that the man's own statement, submitted and signed by himself, is to the effect that he had been treated in a kindly and courteous manner; that his teeth had been efficiently cared for; that, despite the fact that he had stated to his Congressman that he was neglected and had not been examined, evidence is on file to show that X-ray pictures were taken as follows: One of his head, one of his shoulder, two of his lungs, two of his teeth, three or four of his abdomen, and stomach tests to the number of three were made, and every decayed tooth in his head but one, which was then in the process of treatment, had been fully treated.

11. Eva Beuking, reported as charging Dr. Cobb, the commanding officer, with disrespectful language toward the Congress of the United States. The facts are that this woman represented herself alternately as a representative of the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A., was disavowed by both organizations, and Dr. Cobb testifies that he has never seen her. It is presumable that an officer with 33 years of service to his credit would hardly be so indiscreet and disloyal as to be guilty of the charge, which is based entirely upon the unsupported testimony of this woman, who conducts a small candy and tobacco store, and whose veracity, as above shown, is impeached by both the Red Cross and the Y. M. C. A.

12. Suicide in hospital: The statement is made in the Margolis letter that a suicide occurred in the hospital and that rumors are that he committed suicide because during the week he was in the hospital he got no treatment and was in terrible pain. The facts, amply substantiated by testimony, are that the suicide in question, Thomas B. Delicate, was brought to the hospital by the police on March 5; was sent by a nurse at his own request to a bathroom to wash up, and a few minutes later, on hearing peculiar noises in the bathroom, the door was forced open and Delicate was seen over the bathtub hacking at his throat with a razor blade. He was immediately taken to the operating room, but died on the table. He was in the hospital less than one and one-half hours when he died.

CONCLUSIONS.

From the above charges, amply substantiated by sworn testimony submitted in the full report, it is easily seen that no one of the above charges can be sustained.

Respectfully,

J. H. WHITE,
Assistant Surgeon General.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS ON THE BONUS BILL.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD for three legislative days on the bonus bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have three legislative days to extend remarks on the bonus bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I appreciate that it is customary at the end of a session to grant general leave to extend remarks in the RECORD, but that general leave is invariably abused. Now, unless this request, if it is granted, can be restricted to the Members' own remarks, without resolutions or letters or poems or songs or editorials or any of these extraneous matters, I am going to object. If the gentleman will permit Members to give their own views, confining it to their own remarks on the bonus bill, I will not object.

Mr. BLACK. I object.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that no quorum is present.

Mr. KING. At the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will withdraw that.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. COLE] is absent on business connected with the Committee on Indian Affairs. Had he been present Saturday and had the opportunity he would have voted "aye" on the bonus bill.

PURCHASE OF CAVALRY HORSES.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute upon the subject of the Army foolishly buying unnecessary Cavalry horses in peace times.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the San Angelo Standard published last Friday and other newspapers published in Texas advised that Army agents from Fort Reno and Oklahoma City were buying Cavalry horses for the Government and had recently purchased 150 such horses. Has this Congress authorized the Army to buy horses indiscriminately over the western portion of Texas in peace time? I think it is outrageous for the War Department at this time to continue buying unnecessary horses when we have a surplus of horses in the Army now, and I think that the best thing this Congress can do before we adjourn is, through the proper committee, to bring in a resolution directing the War Department to cease buying horses in time of peace.

Mr. DYER. Why does not the gentleman ask the Secretary of War to stop that?

Mr. BLANTON. We do not have to pass the buck. We have authority here to stop it ourselves. All we have to do is to command the Secretary of War to cease.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the war-risk insurance act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the development of our merchant marine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request, and accept the suggestions and reservations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does not the gentleman from Michigan think it rather remarkable on a bill where only 40 minutes of debate was had, to permit the RECORD to be lumbered up with a hundred or more alleged speeches made on the subject?

Mr. MCARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the subject of the par check clearing system.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I couple with that a request to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the same subject?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] to so extend their remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon legislation affecting the West, principally public-land legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the agricultural situation in the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which state?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. There is only one state.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, which Union, ours or Mr. Gompers's?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The old one. Some of us have been in all of the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, what is the request as stated by the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the state of the Union. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman was in the House when I objected to any extension of remarks upon the bonus bill. I presume the extension he has in mind does not include the bonus bill?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no; it had no reference to the bonus bill. I think the less said about the bonus bill the better. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES IN ENROLLING ROOM.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until and including June 5, 1920, not exceeding the sum of \$100, for the employment of such additional clerical and messenger service as may be necessary in the enrolling room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is usual at the close of a session, in order to make the necessary provision for additional assistance in the enrolling room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we were all cheered this morning by the reappearance on the floor of the House of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Applause.] We are delighted to have him once more with us, and we all join in the hope for his complete restoration to health. [Applause.] We welcome him back to the House. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on the river and harbor bill. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I must object.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 11892, the river and harbor appropriation bill, and I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up the conference report on the river and harbor bill and asks unanimous consent

that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement was read.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 11, 15, 18, 20, 24, 26, 27, 32, 40, 43, 57, and 65.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 62, and 63, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with its insertion on page 10, after line 16; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the proposed amendment strike out the word "Sterlings" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Starlings," and strike out the word "Accomack" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Accomac"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Charlotte Harbor, Fla., with a view to securing a channel of suitable dimensions to Punta Gorda."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Harbor at St. Petersburg, Fla."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Tennessee River and tributaries, in North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the proposed amendment strike out the word "Pollocksville," in line 4, insert in lieu thereof the word "Polloksville," and transfer the item so amended to page 5, after line 5; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the word "deep" and insert in lieu thereof the word "depth," and in line 18 of the amendment strike out the word "Cerritos" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Cerritos"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "with a view to"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the proposed amendment strike out the word "appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the proposed amendment strike out the word "appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 6. That the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, passed between March 4, 1913, until and including the laws of the third session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, shall be compiled under the direction of the Secretary of War and printed as a document, and that 600 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the War Department."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the proposed amendment strike out the word "appropriation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

C. A. KENNEDY,
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
THOS. GALLAGHER,

Managers on the part of the House.

W. L. JONES,
CHAS. L. McNARY,
JOS. E. RANSDELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11892) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The rivers and harbors bill as it passed the House carried cash appropriations in the sum of \$12,400,000. The amount added by amendment in the Senate was \$12,000,000, making the total amount carried by the bill as it passed the Senate \$24,400,000. As a result of the conference, the amount involved in the Senate amendments has not been changed, no agreement having been reached by the committee of conference on amendment No. 1, the only amendment proposing a change in the amount appropriated by the House.

The following statement shows the action taken by the conference on each of the Senate amendments (page numbers refer to print of bill with Senate amendments numbered):

On amendment No. 1, page 1: Item increases amount appropriated by House for maintenance and improvement of such river and harbor works heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation from \$12,000,000 to \$24,000,000. The committee of conference have been unable to agree on this amendment.

On amendment No. 2, page 2: Item strikes out proviso in House bill directing that of the \$12,000,000 appropriated for improvement and maintenance of works heretofore authorized \$5,000,000 shall be expended for maintenance work and \$7,000,000 for improvement work. House conferees recede. In the hearings before the Senate committee it developed that possibly more than \$5,000,000 would be required for maintenance; that if left in the House form a double set of accounts would have to be kept with the Treasury Department, involving additional clerical work; and on a number of the projects it is difficult to discern between maintenance and improvement work.

On amendment No. 3, page 3: Item inserts the following paragraph to section of bill providing for examinations and surveys:

"Every report submitted to Congress in pursuance of this section or of any provision of law for a survey hereafter enacted, in addition to other information which the Congress has heretofore directed shall be given, shall contain a statement of special or local benefit which will accrue to localities affected by such improvement and a statement of general or national benefits, with recommendations as to what local cooperation should be required, if any, on account of such special or local benefit."

House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 4, page 3: Survey of Camden Harbor, Me. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 5, page 4: Survey of South Bay, Boston Harbor, Mass. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 6: Item transfers House provision, which was misplaced. (See amendment No. 38, p. 11.) House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 7, page 4: Survey of Delaware River from Trenton, N. J., to Easton, Pa. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 8, page 4: Survey of Woodbridge Creek, N. J. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 9, page 5: Item amends House provision for survey of Raritan River, N. J., by striking out the words

"including that section above the Washington Canal." House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 10, page 5: Senate amendment amends provisos in items in river and harbor acts of 1910 and 1911 appropriating for the improvement of St. Jones River, Del. The effect of this amendment would be to allow work to proceed on the excavation of any single cut-off when the land for that cut-off is transferred to the United States free of cost, instead of delaying the prosecution of the improvement until the land required for the 16 cut-offs covered by the project is furnished free of cost by local interests. It also eliminates the following language from the items in the acts of 1910 and 1911 above referred to: "and the United States shall have been released from all claims for damages arising from the proposed diversion of the stream." House conferees recede with an amendment transferring the item to section 4 of the bill.

On amendment No. 11, page 5: Survey of lower 2 miles of Northwest River, N. C. and Va. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 12, page 6: Survey of Warwick River, Va. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 13, page 6: Survey of Starlings Creek, Accomac County, Va., and channel connecting said creek with Pocomoke Sound. House conferees recede with verbal amendment.

On amendment No. 14, page 6: Survey of channel leading from Oyster, Va., to Atlantic Ocean. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 15, page 6: Survey of channel connecting York River, Va., with Back Creek. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 16, page 6: Survey of Carters Creek, Lancaster County, Va. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 17, page 6: Survey of Morattico Creek, Lancaster County, Va. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 18, page 6: Item amends House provision for survey of Savannah harbor by extending the area over which survey is to be made about 4½ miles up the Savannah River to Drakes Cut. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 19, page 7: Survey of St. Marks River, Wakulla County, Fla. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 20, page 7: Survey of Charlotte harbor channel, South Boca Grande, Fla. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 21, page 7: Survey of narrows between Choctawhatchee Bar and Santa Rosa Sound, Fla., including the swash channel from Camp Walton to Mary Esther. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 22, page 7: Survey of Charlotte Harbor to Punta Gorda with a view to increasing the dimensions of the channel from Punta Gorda to the Gulf, including Boca Grande Channel. House conferees recede with an amendment confining the survey to the channel leading to Punta Gorda.

On amendment No. 23, page 7: Survey of St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., and to deep water in Tampa Bay, with a view to increasing the dimensions of the channel and existing project from the docks to deep water in the bay. House conferees recede with an amendment making the item read as follows: "Harbor at St. Petersburg, Fla."

On amendment No. 24, page 7: To the House item providing a survey of "St. Johns River, Fla., from Jacksonville to the ocean," the Senate amendment adds the following: "and St. Johns River from Lake Harney to Indian River to create a navigable waterway from St. Johns River to Indian River." Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 25, page 7: Senate amendment adds word "Florida" to House item providing survey of Apalachicola Bay, Fla. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 26, page 8: Item provides survey for Apalachicola River, at Apalachicola, Fla., and Apalachicola Bay, Fla. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 27, page 8: Survey with a view to reporting whether the existing project provides sufficient depths to enable the deepest draft ships of the regular lines calling at Brunswick Harbor, Ga., to reach their docks without being delayed by waiting for the tide or using two tides to enter or leave the harbor; and, if adequate depths are not provided by the existing project, whether sufficient depths would be provided by the larger of the two projects reported in House Document No. 393, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 28, page 8: Survey of Gulfport Harbor and Ship Island Pass, Miss. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 29, page 8: Survey of Mississippi River, La., with a view to securing an outlet to the Gulf of Mexico by the most practical route for a permanent channel of a depth not exceeding 35 feet. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 30, page 8: Survey of Tensas River, La. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 31, page 8: Survey of Galveston Channel, Tex. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 32, page 9: Strikes out House item providing that a preliminary examination and survey shall be made of the "coast of Texas in the vicinity of Aransas Pass, Port Aransas, Corpus Christi, and Rockport, with a view to the establishment of a safe and adequate harbor," and inserts in lieu thereof an item directing that a survey of these localities shall be made by a board of engineers with a view to the establishment of a safe and adequate harbor or harbors, including protection against storms and erosions and the protection of the instrumentalities and aids of commerce located there. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 33, page 9: Survey of La Grue River, Ark. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 34, page 9: Survey of Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky. House conferees recede with an amendment making the item read: "Tennessee River and tributaries, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky."

On amendment No. 35, page 10: Survey of outlet of Cass Lake, Minn., with a view of securing a navigable connection with the Mississippi River. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 36, page 10: Survey of Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C. House conferees recede with amendment making slight verbal change.

On amendment No. 37, page 10: Survey of south fork of Kentucky River, Ky. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 38, page 11: Transfer item inserted by the House to page 4 of bill. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 39, page 11: House provision which ordered a survey of Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., is amended so as to provide for a preliminary examination and survey. House conferees recede with amendment correcting two typographical errors.

On amendment No. 40, page 13: Survey of Tillamook Bay, Oreg. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 41, page 13: Survey of Tualatin River, Oreg. House conferees recede.

On amendments Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47, pages 13 and 14: Items make slight verbal changes to House provisions for surveys. House conferees recede with slight verbal changes in Nos. 42 and 43.

On amendment No. 48, page 14: Survey of Wrangell Harbor, Alaska. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 49, page 14: Survey of harbor of Christiansburg, St. Croix, Virgil Islands. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 50, page 15: Item amends House bill by combining sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 into one section (sec. 4). House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 51, page 15: Item amends House provision authorizing the Secretary of War to credit local interests in the vicinity of Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg. (in requiring compliance with the conditions precedent to the prosecution of the project adopted in the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919), with the cost of work done by them which conforms to the project plans, by directing that credit shall be given at the present cost of doing the work which has been done. The act of 1919 required that local interests should pay half the cost of the work adopted, or \$418,000. Under a permit from the Secretary of War and under the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the local interests had commenced work on the project and had expended, up to June 30, 1919, the sum of \$133,976. House conferees recede.

On amendments Nos. 52, 53, and 54, pages 15 and 16, strike out section numbers. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 55, page 16: Transfers section 9 of House bill, at bottom of page 17, to section 4 of bill as amended by Senate. House conferees recede with slight verbal change.

On amendment No. 56, page 16: Item provides that the sum of \$71,775, when deposited in the Treasury by local interests, shall be accepted by the Secretary of War as the total cash contribution required under the provision in the river and harbor act approved July 27, 1916, adopting a new project for the improvement of Willapa Harbor and River, Wash. Under the condition referred to local interests were required to pay half the cost, which was estimated to be \$71,775. Due to increase in cost of doing the work contemplated the sum mentioned will not pay half the cost of completing the work at this time. The effect of the amendment will be to relieve local interests of the necessity of making further contribution toward the prosecution of the work covered by this project. House conferees recede with slight verbal change.

On amendment No. 57, page 17: Item provides that the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, in requiring compliance with the conditions precedent to the prosecution of the project

adopted in the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919, credit local interests with the cost of so much of the work performed by the city of Houston and the Harris County Houston ship channel navigation district in the construction of the turning basin and channel in the Houston ship channel, Tex., as conforms to the project plans and standards of the Government. Senate conferees recede.

On amendment No. 58, page 17: Item authorizes the transfer of dredge *Cumberland* from Fernandina Harbor, Fla., to Savannah Harbor, Ga., without charge. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 59, page 17: Changes section number. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 60, page 17: Strikes out section 9 of House bill. The language of the House section was reinserted by the Senate in section 4, amendment No. 55. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 61, page 18: Item provides for printing the laws relating to rivers and harbors passed between March 4, 1913, and March 4, 1921. House conferees recede with an amendment directing that the compilation shall be printed as a document and 600 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the War Department.

On amendment No. 62, page 18: Item provides that appropriations heretofore made or provided in this act for improvement work on rivers and harbors may be used for maintenance work whenever from any cause they may have become seriously impaired, but prohibits the diversion of funds from one project to another. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 63, page 18: Item authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, to the Chief of Engineers, for use in prosecuting civil works under his direction, such material, supplies, instruments, vehicles, machinery, or other equipment, pertaining to the Military Establishment as are or may hereafter be found to be surplus and no longer required for military purposes. House conferees recede.

On amendment No. 64, page 19: Item amends section 4 of the river and harbor act approved June 25, 1910, which authorizes the Secretary of War to adjust and settle all claims for damages by collision against vessels belonging to the United States, where the claim is not in excess of \$500, if, in his judgment, after investigation, the claim is just, by authorizing the Secretary of War to settle, in like manner, whenever, in the prosecution of river and harbor works, an accident occurs, damaging or destroying property belonging to any person or corporation, and whenever personal property of employees of the United States who are employed on or in connection with river and harbor works is damaged or destroyed in connection with the loss, threatened loss, or damage to United States property, or through efforts to save life or to preserve United States property such claims as are found, in his judgment, to be just, and which do not exceed \$500 in cost to the Government for a single claim. House conferees recede with slight verbal change.

On amendment No. 65, page 20: Item provides for transfer and sale of land which was made by the deposit of spoil in the prosecution of river improvement work at Alexandria, Va. The question as to whether the title to this land lies in the United States or the riparian owners is now involved in a friendly suit before the District Supreme Court. Senate conferees recede.

C. A. KENNEDY,
S. WALLACE DEMPSEY,
THOS. GALLAGHER,

Managers on the part of the House.

During the reading of the statement, Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad at this time to make an inquiry of the chairman with reference to an item, or shall I wait until the reading of the statement is finished?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait until the statement is finished.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the statement. Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Senate added 65 amendments to the House bill, and we reached an agreement on all the amendments except amendment No. 1, which raises the amount carried in the House bill from \$12,000,000 to \$24,000,000. Of these 65 amendments 31 were for surveys. The conferees on the part of the House agreed to all the amendments for surveys that came within the rule under which surveys are ordered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee, which is that they will not order a survey where an adverse report was made within four years. The Senate conferees receded from such survey amendments as did not come within the rule. All told, there were something like 10 legislative amendments. There is only one which affects the policy heretofore followed, and that is amendment No. 3. This amendment requires the engineers in reporting on surveys to make a statement as to

what local or special benefits will accrue to localities affected by such improvements and recommend local cooperation if the facts warrant. The conferees thought that was a very good amendment to agree to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Col. Taylor in his testimony before the committee urgently recommended \$42,000,000—I have the hearings before me. Along toward the latter part of his testimony he recommended \$27,000,000 as the minimum. He based his recommendation upon the work that was to be done on surveys, maintenance, and other work, as mentioned in his reports. Now, I note from the hearings that he recommends \$130,000 for Gulfport Harbor for maintenance and he recommends \$60,000 for Pascagoula Harbor. I understand from Col. Taylor that if this appropriation is cut to \$12,000,000 that it will be absolutely impossible to maintain those harbors. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to Pascagoula Harbor, that there has been for the last two years a large shipbuilding plant established there, employing several thousand men, also there are a large number of wooden-ship building plants, or have been there—most of them are being discontinued. Now, the Government has spent thousands and thousands of dollars upon this harbor. There is now a bar lying between Horn Island Pass and Pascagoula Harbor, or the Louisville & Nashville Railroad bridge, which, if removed, would give a 26-foot channel to the Gulf. Now, unless that harbor is improved, of course all the money that has been spent by the Government there will have been lost, unless Congress later on makes appropriation for it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. How does it happen the Government spent so much money at a point where there is no water?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. The gentleman is very much mistaken about that.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, if there is an adequate supply of water it would not be necessary to have the dredging to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. The gentleman is mistaken about that. The hearings will show that at the mouth of the Pascagoula River there are 26 feet of water between the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.'s line and Horn Island Pass, except a bar the Government is now working on.

The Government is now dredging that bar, cutting it out so that any ocean-going vessel can pass over it; but if this appropriation for this point is not increased, seagoing vessels carrying a heavy amount of tonnage can not pass over that bar, so I seriously urge on the committee to take this matter into consideration. Now, in respect to Gulfport Harbor, the appropriation recommended by Col. Taylor is \$130,000. With a \$12,000,000 appropriation for all the ports of the country, he does not see how this can be made. Of course, I appreciate there is a small sum remaining on hand—I believe he estimates about \$12,000,000 to be distributed—but I call the attention of the chairman to the fact that these appropriations can not be used except for specific places mentioned in the bill. That is true, is it not, that this money can not be diverted except as the act of Congress specifies?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is money already appropriated for specific projects. But any of the money carried in this bill under the amendment agreed to permits the use of any of the \$12,000,000 for improvement or maintenance work.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. If the gentleman will just permit me to finish this, I hope the gentleman and his committee will see their way clear toward increasing the appropriation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman we had this in our minds. We just discussed at one meeting the amount to be carried in the bill. The chairman of the Commerce Committee asked that he be permitted to take that amendment back to the Senate. He seemed to feel that he had misled the Senate by a statement he made on the floor. He evidently misunderstood what Col. Taylor said.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The chairman intends to ask for a further conference on amendment No. 1, which, I take it, is the only one in dispute, covering the amount of money to be appropriated.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes. When the proper time comes I shall ask that the House further insist on its disagreement to that amendment and send it back to conference.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Is it not a fact that there are over \$50,000,000 on hand still unexpended?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The report made by the Chief of Engineers on date of April 1 shows that on the 1st day of July there will be unexpended balances amounting to over \$53,000,000 to carry the work of emergency river and harbor improvement for eight months, up to the 1st of March, 1921, without taking into consideration the amount carried in this bill.

Mr. SNELL. And if we appropriate \$24,000,000 more it makes over \$60,000,000 to be available next year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. It will mean that with the provisions of the House bill there will be over \$65,000,000 to carry on the work of river and harbor improvement for eight months, or five times as much as was expended on all the projects during the last fiscal year.

Mr. SNELL. Under the present conditions of labor and material is it possible to spend more money than that during the coming year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Col. Taylor told me within the last three or four days that they hoped to be able to expend about \$40,000,000 next year.

Mr. SNELL. You have more money appropriated now, to say nothing of the bill that passed the House, by \$12,000,000 than they can possibly spend next year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Then why should we increase the amount carried in the House bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. So far the Senate conferees have not convinced us it is needed.

Mr. SNELL. I hope that the House conferees will stick with great tenacity on the \$12,000,000 in the present bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not possible to give instructions to the conferees to that effect?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I do not think we ought to be instructed.

Mr. TREADWAY. In reference to this \$50,000,000 that is on hand, can it be changed from one project to another at the will of the engineers?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. No.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is limited to the projects for which it was appropriated?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is true.

Mr. TREADWAY. But the \$12,000,000 can be apportioned as the engineers see fit, where the needs of the service show it should be done?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is the case; and I will state, as I said when the bill was considered in the House, that I consider this \$12,000,000 as an emergency proposition.

Mr. TREADWAY. At their discretion?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I join the gentleman in thinking that the House conferees, if they do not desire further instruction from the House, should insist on keeping the item not to exceed the House appropriation of \$12,000,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. JOHNSON] asked me what was the most that has ever been spent during a fiscal year. I will say that I think about \$39,000,000 is the most that has ever been spent in one year in the history of the Government, and the amount we will have on hand under the House bill on the 1st of July will be more than twice that sum.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state how much was expended last year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. A trifle over \$21,000,000 in all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I want to call attention to this fact: As shown by Col. Taylor, the reason why more was not spent on these projects and more improvements made was on account of war conditions. Labor and coal will be an increased item, as Col. Taylor states in his report, and that ought to be taken into consideration. A few years ago the cost of coal and labor was a great deal less than it will be at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that the expenditures for this fiscal year, estimating for May and June, will amount to just about \$30,000,000.

Mr. BAER. Is it not a fact that contracts are being made now at a cost of about 300 per cent more than normal?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Cost seems to be abnormal.

Mr. VARE. They were abnormal last year, and they are still abnormal, and would it not be a good business proposition not to go too hastily with large contracts during these abnormal times?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that Col. Taylor stated when before our committee he did not

think it advisable to make continuing contracts at this time, because there is a strong probability that the cost of doing the work would be reduced.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What objection has the gentleman to the House instructing the conferees to vote for \$24,000,000 instead of \$12,000,000?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I have this objection, that I do not think it is needed.

Mr. SWEET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. SWEET. How much of the \$53,000,000 that you claim is now on hand is already contracted for to complete special projects?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that on April 1 about \$27,000,000 was under contract or allotted. That means that on April 1 there was \$27,000,000 in cash to pay for work under contract, to be done in the future.

Mr. SWEET. Extending over how long a time?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that there are eight projects where the contracts total in each case more than \$500,000. But in most cases, where there is a million or two million under contract they are let out under several contracts; that is, the amount covers several contracts. So that as near as we can tell the whole amount under contract will not be expended up until March 4, 1921. On such projects as are estimated for in this bill, 49 of them, there will be about \$5,000,000 of the amount under contract unexpended March 1, 1921.

Mr. SWEET. How much did your bill carry for maintenance and upkeep outside of the special projects that have been contracted for?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The lump-sum provision as amended by the Senate, and to which the House conferees agreed, provides that the entire \$12,000,000 can be used for maintenance or improvement work on any project that is needed.

Mr. SWEET. And that is left to the discretion of the engineers?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is left to the discretion of the engineers, and under that provision they must use it where it is needed in the interest of commerce.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], and that of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], expressing the hope that the conferees would insist upon the provision put in the House bill. I want to express the hope that the conferees will not take this instruction of these gentlemen as an instruction of the House to the conferees. The people of the Mississippi Valley are very much interested in this matter, and I am hoping that the conferees will approach the Senate conferees on this question with open minds and give it their most serious consideration.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Without doubt that will be done.

Mr. MONDELL. If there is any doubt on that question, we will have that doubt settled right here, before this conference report goes back to the Senate.

Nine-tenths of the House know—practically everyone in the House knows—that every dollar is appropriated here that is necessary for any project in the country where there is water and commerce, and that another dollar added to the sum carried in the House bill is a dollar that is unnecessary and not needed and a waste of public money; and I am sure that the House will not stand for anything of that kind. And if it requires instruction to the conferees the House will give the instruction, and if instructions are not given—definite, binding instructions—it will be because the House believes that the Senate is prepared to recede, and that the conferees on the part of the House will insist on the Senate receding.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will call the gentleman's [Mr. MONDELL] attention to the fact that there are no ports in the State of Wyoming, and if this were a reclamation scheme the gentleman would be in favor of expending every dollar in the Treasury.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman from Wyoming is expressing his opinion about things as to which, I think, he has not full information, and I am not sure that we will do exactly what he states.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. We discussed it for a few moments, and at the request of the Senate conferees we let them take it back to the Senate. We passed on these other matters.

Mr. DENISON. I want to see a river and harbor bill enacted, but if the attitude of the gentleman from Wyoming is to be insisted upon here we may not have any river and harbor bill whatever.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. The gentleman is aware, is he not, of the fact that Col. Taylor, in his testimony before the Commerce Committee of the Senate, said that he recommended \$24,000,000 as being the irreducible minimum if these improvement projects were to receive the proper completion and the work is to be maintained.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I think he qualified that statement before the House committee. He said that statement was based on the policy of the engineers to complete the existing projects without delay. He did not say that \$24,000,000 was necessary in the interest of commerce.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. I heard Col. Taylor's statement before the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and it was absolute, I think, that the \$24,000,000 he regards as the irreducible minimum in order that the interests of the Government may be protected in the money already expended, and in order that the work may be conducted with anything like reasonable dispatch.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Col. Taylor wrote to the chairman of the committee that \$18,000,000 was, in his judgment, the least amount with which they could meet the needs of commerce.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. He may have reduced the irreducible minimum, but I would like to ask the gentleman one other question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. BLAND of Missouri. I understand that the gentleman will not ask for positive instructions to-day?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I shall ask that the House further insist.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] made some reference as to what the attitude of the House might be. As I understand it, the vote of the House now stands for \$12,000,000 as the appropriation. Now, I agree with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that if there is any question about that being the limit of the amount the House desires to have go into the appropriation bill we had better instruct the conferees right now. But I yield to the superior judgment and wishes of the chairman of the committee, and the gentlemen who probably will be conferees with him, and will not ask for a vote instructing them at this time. I think, however, the House is in the attitude of being ready to pass such a vote if it felt that it was necessary in order to strengthen such support as the conferees desire to limit the amount to \$12,000,000. I for one think it is ample, with the \$50,000,000 already on hand, to do all that is necessary in these days of high prices; and I think, further, that as the matter now stands, the House conferees do not need an instruction to the effect that \$12,000,000 is the amount that the House favors, and that we do not favor any more.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I hope that the conferees will not think that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is expressing the judgment of the House upon this matter. I know the wish of this House is that the amount shall not be less than the amount that the Senate authorized. I think we ought to have an ample amount, and if any instruction is necessary I think we could get instruction to adhere to the position of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Notwithstanding the claim of the majority leader of the House [Mr. MONDELL] in regard to rivers and harbors, in which he said that every Member knew that the amount carried in this bill was as much or more than could be expended, I want to ask this question: The amount already appropriated for the Ohio River that will be available this year is over \$4,000,000, is it not?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. No; over \$9,000,000 is on hand. Between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 is tied up in contracts for work to be done in the future. There is between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000 allotted that the department can "pull back," if necessary.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In view of the fact that the Congress established several years ago the policy of a 9-foot stage in the Ohio River, which we all know if completed at the 9-foot stage would be as great an artery of commerce as there is in the world, and in view of the fact that the lowest dam that is now being constructed is only at Henderson, Ky., which I believe

is about 165 miles from that point to the mouth of the Ohio, why could there not be more than this amount expended there in the year, when Congress pledged to the people along that river that the work would be speedily finished?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I do not know whether they have definitely determined as yet whether they would improve the lower reach of the river by the lock and dam system or by means of open-channel work. I do not know whether that is decided on or not; but in regard to the other question that the gentleman from Kentucky asked, Col. Taylor said they already had at work all the contractors that they could get to do that work. They could not get more bidders, because it requires an expensive plant that would be almost worthless after they had completed the contract.

Mr. KINCHELOE. You spoke of those two propositions. What other proposition could be invoked there, except locks and dams, to improve the navigation of the Ohio River? They certainly could not dredge it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. They have figured that they could probably dredge it cheaper from Henderson, Ky., down. The only difficulty that might arise by improving by open-channel work is that there might not be sufficient water in the Ohio River at certain periods of the year between Henderson, Ky., and the mouth of the Tennessee River to maintain the 9-foot channel. I think they will finally agree to improve it by the lock and dam system.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The question is, When are they going to decide that proposition?

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. LAYTON. Is it not also a fact that in addition to the \$53,000,000, together with the \$12,000,000 of new appropriations, the engineering department of the Government is confronted with a lack of dredges for the prosecution of this work, and that one of the great handicaps under which they are now laboring is to get dredges to do this work, which dredges it takes two or three years probably to build, some of them?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is true.

Mr. OGDEN. Can the gentleman state whether the unexpended balance for the Ohio River will be sufficient to continue these projects during the next fiscal year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I do not think there is any doubt about it. If I were asked my idea about it, I should say there would be a hold over of several million dollars on the 4th of March, 1921.

Mr. OGDEN. Is any part of the appropriation carried in this bill to be allotted for work on any of those projects?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That will be allotted in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. They will allot this \$12,000,000 where it is most needed in the interest of commerce.

Mr. OGDEN. It has not been indicated as to how it will be allotted?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Oh, no; and will not be, until after they have figured on it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Iowa will recall that in the last river and harbor appropriation bill, or perhaps the one before that, the Secretary of War was authorized to experiment with the open-channel work below Hendersonville with a view to determining whether a 9-foot stage could be maintained in the Ohio River in that way. Can the gentleman state what work has been done by the department in the way of experimentation on that proposition to determine whether that will be feasible?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I will say to the gentleman that two years ago, in the river and harbor appropriation bill, we gave authority to the Secretary of War to modify the Ohio River project if he thought it was more desirable to improve that reach of the river by open-channel work.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman is mistaken about that. We did not go to the extent of authorizing him to modify it, but we authorized him to experiment with this modification and report back to Congress, so that Congress could determine whether it would eliminate those locks and dams in the lower river.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. I think we modified the project to the extent of permitting him to do that if it was more economical and desirable.

Mr. BARKLEY. We passed a provision that he must report back to Congress. I remember the colloquy which occurred at

the time that the bill was amended in that way, when it was stated that if he reported back to Congress, and Congress did not authorize it, the project would go on as originally planned.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The gentleman may be correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. I want to know if anything has been done to demonstrate whether this modification can be put into effect on the lower river. My reason for asking that is that the longer the experiment is put off the longer will be the postponement of the construction of those locks and dams that are necessary to create this 9-foot channel in the lower river.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I did not suppose it required any experiment. I thought the Board of Engineers was going to pass on the proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is in the nature of an experiment. I think the result of it must be reported back to the Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That may be the case, but I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. DEMPSEY. We will find out before the bill comes back again from the conferees.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNBAR. As I understand it there is an unexpended balance of \$5,000,000 available for the construction of locks and dams in the Ohio River.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. There was more than \$9,000,000 available on the 1st of April for lock and dam construction work on the Ohio River.

Mr. DUNBAR. More than \$9,000,000?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. More than \$9,000,000.

Mr. DUNBAR. And during the coming fiscal year it will be impossible for the War Department, under the ordinary conditions which exist on that river, to spend more than that \$9,000,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. If I were giving a guess, I should say there would be more than half of it left at the end of the nine months' period, March 4, 1921.

Mr. DUNBAR. So that under the reduced appropriation which will be effected by your bill the improvement of the Ohio River in the construction of locks and dams will be retarded in no way.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DUNBAR. And the work will be prosecuted to the fullest extent, so far as the engineers of the War Department find it possible to go ahead with the work.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I think that is correct.

Mr. OGDEN. Is that the opinion of Col. Taylor?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. That is my understanding. Last year they were tied up on account of high water. When the stage of the water is such that they can work, they lose no time.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Col. Taylor testified particularly as to this river work, and said it was limited only by the available plants, that they were using every plant that was in there and they could not induce contractors to move in with new plants because of the great expense of moving the plant, and because of the great volume of work offered the contractors throughout the Nation. In other words, every plant is busy to its full capacity and, as the chairman says, I do not believe you can expend half the money available for that project.

Mr. OGDEN. I will say to the gentleman that it is the purpose of Louisville to erect a pier, and it is dependent on these projects being completed and this work going forward. If the appropriation is not sufficient to permit the work to go forward it will discourage the municipal work that is contemplated.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I do not think the gentleman need have any fear on that score.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield me five minutes?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to thoroughly understand the situation before this bill goes back to conference. The House provided a general appropriation of \$12,000,000 for river and harbor work. The House passed a "porkless" river and harbor bill. The bill went to the Senate and the lump-sum appropriation of \$12,000,000 was increased to \$20,000,000. The House conferees were anxious to learn from the Senate conferees the reason for that increase. What was their surprise to find that not only was there no more reason for that increased appropriation than appeared when the bill was considered by the House, but that as time had passed during the interval conditions had been such that a much smaller amount of money had been contracted and spent than was anticipated.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. To make that definite, let me say that the estimated expense was \$5,000,000 a month, and when we got the report for the period elapsed it turned out to be less than two and one-half millions a month. The Senate had the information that there would be thirteen millions on hand on the 1st day of July, and it turned out to be the fact that there will be \$52,000,000 entirely aside from the appropriation in this bill.

Mr. MONDELL. In other words, the Senate added \$8,000,000 to this bill by reason of misinformation. Eight million dollars, wholly unnecessary, added to the bill; \$8,000,000 that could not be used. As a matter of fact, unless conditions shall change and a much larger sum be spent per month than has been recently or is likely to be spent in the future, there will be a considerable sum left at the end of the fiscal year, even with the \$12,000,000 appropriation.

I realize that gentlemen who live in regions where there are river and harbor improvements are constantly importuned by boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and interested citizens to boost appropriations in the hope that by so doing their communities will secure a larger expenditure. And unfortunately such citizens at home are sometimes disposed to assert their opinions in the matter against that of the Representative who is much better informed. They thus place gentlemen in a somewhat embarrassing position at home.

Let me suggest to these gentlemen who are somewhat worried by these importunities from home that the attitude for them to take is this: That we are not only appropriating in the bill as it passed the House all the money that can be used, taken together with the sums available in the Treasury, but we are appropriating more than can be used economically or advantageously, more than will be used from present appearances, and that therefore in urging further appropriations they would not be helping their constituents or their cause. They would simply be urging the House to appropriate sums that are not necessary, to increase appropriations beyond what is needed, when the Treasury is already burdened with enormous appropriations, when our expenditures exceed our income.

No gentleman wants to be in that position, and gentlemen will be in a much better position at home, in my opinion, if they will tell their constituents what the situation is—a situation which is entirely satisfactory as it stands with the appropriation made by the House.

The House is not in favor of increasing this sum a dollar, and that ought to be understood. If there was any question about its not being understood, I should be inclined to insist on instructions, but I think it is a more satisfactory proceeding for the House to further insist on its disagreement. I believe that the Senate will yield, that it expects to yield, and that it knows that it ought to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1 and agree to the conference asked for, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1 and agree to the conference asked for.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, Mr. DEMPSEY, and Mr. GALLAGHER.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee, reported the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARD reserved all points of order.

PERRY L. HAYNES.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of Perry L. Haynes, on the Speaker's table, with the Senate amendment thereto, and move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut calls up the bill (H. R. 1309) for the relief of Perry L. Haynes, with a Senate amendment thereto, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have the bill reported.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. That is true. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be again reported. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is this the case of the lieutenant who was held responsible for some money intrusted to a subordinate?

Mr. MERRITT. Yes; and the Senate passed the bill and inserted the phrase "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER, ILL.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 4431) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rock River in Lee County, State of Illinois, at or near the city of Dixon, in said county, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, a similar House bill having been reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up Senate bill 4431, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Illinois Central Railroad Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rock River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Dixon, in Lee County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that this is a Senate bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. GARD. And that a similar bill is on the House Calendar?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; a similar House bill has been reported favorably from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McKENZIE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. McKENZIE, a similar House bill, H. R. 14150, was ordered to lie on the table.

ASSOCIATION OF PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize the Association of Producers of Agricultural Products for further consideration by the House under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota calls up for further consideration the bill H. R. 13931, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. In section 2 of the bill, on page 3, there is provision that the Secretary of Agriculture shall file in the district court in which such association has its principal place of business a certified copy of the order and of all the records in the proceeding, together with a petition asking that the order be enforced, and also that he shall give notice to the Attorney General and to said association of such filing. Who will be in charge of that litigation for the Government, the Attorney General or the attorney for the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The Department of Justice shall have charge of such order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill, and I think the House is entitled to hear the explanation of it by the gentleman from Minnesota. For that reason I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Drewry	Kahn	Rayburn
Andrews, Md.	Eagan	Kelly, Pa.	Reber
Anthony	Eagle	Kendall	Riordan
Bacharach	Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan
Baer	Elliott	Kettner	Rucker
Bell	Ellsworth	Kless	Sanders, La.
Benham	Eiston	Kitchin	Scully
Booher	Emerson	Klecza	Sears
Bowers	Evans, Nev.	Kreider	Sells
Brinson	Ferris	Langley	Sherwood
Britten	Fisher	Lankford	Shreve
Brumbaugh	Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Sisson
Burke	Gallivan	Leibach	Slemp
Byrnes, S. C.	Garland	Leshner	Small
Campbell, Kans.	Godwin, N. C.	Linthicum	Smith, Ill.
Campbell, Pa.	Goldfogle	Little	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Goodall	McClintic	Smith, N. Y.
Caraway	Gould	McCulloch	Smithwick
Carter	Graham, Pa.	McKinley	Snyder
Casey	Greene, Mass.	McLane	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Griest	MacCrate	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Mo.	Griffin	Mansfield	Sullivan
Cole	Hamill	Mason	Tague
Cooper	Hardy, Colo.	Merritt	Taylor, Colo.
Copley	Hardy, Tex.	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Costello	Harrell	Morin	Thomas
Crowther	Hastings	Mott	Tillman
Curry, Calif.	Haugen	Mudd	Tinkham
Dale	Hayden	Nelson, Wis.	Venable
Darrow	Hernandez	Nicholls	Watson
Davey	Hill	O'Connor	Williams
Dempsey	Houghton	Olney	Wilson, Ill.
Denison	Hullings	Osborne	Wingo
Dent	Hutchinson	Paige	Wood, Ind.
Dewalt	Ireland	Porter	Yates
Doelling	Johnson, S. Dak.	Radcliffe	Young, N. Dak.
Doremus	Johnston, N. Y.	Ramsayer	Zihlman
Drane	Juul	Randall, Wis.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACGREGOR). On this vote 279 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for a moment? I desire to ask some questions. I can postpone them or ask them now, as the gentleman prefers.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman prefer to yield now or would the gentleman prefer to postpone the questions?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will use a little time to explain the bill first. Mr. Speaker, I ask that when five minutes are up I be notified. This bill seeks to give to the farmers the right to organize to sell the products of their own members. The first section is modeled upon the ordinary statute authorizing the creation of corporations. Instead of providing that any individual may become a member of a corporation upon conforming to certain regulations, this provides that the farmers may become members of certain associations, which are described and limited so as to make them actually cooperative associations for the purpose of aiding and assisting their respective members in the marketing of the crops that they produce.

Mr. PELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No; my time will not permit it. In the Clayton Antitrust Act there is a provision authorizing associations of this kind, but they are limited so that they can not have capital stock or be organized for profit.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The present law—the Clayton antitrust law—relieves associations of agriculture not having capital stock. Why should we disturb that law; why should not this bill be confined altogether to prospective agricultural associations that are to have capital stock?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Well, personally, I would not have any objection to that, although, as we are granting these associations much larger powers than they had under the Clayton Antitrust Act, it was thought that they ought to be put under some supervision, because there has been complaint against some of these associations, and it was for that reason section 2 was drawn. That section is modeled largely upon some of the provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. May I suggest this to the gentleman, if I do not disturb him: To make section 2 apply to all associations, whether having or not having capital stock, would place a limitation and restriction which the Clayton law does not now contain upon the associations that have no capital stock.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is disputed. The contention is that these associations, if they are organized for the purpose of

carrying on any business, so as to give a profit to their members, are subject to the Sherman law. That is one of the contentions that is being urged against these associations, and it is for that reason that they are asking for legislation of this kind. Now, a great many of these associations have been consulted in reference to this bill and so far as I know they are all favorable to it, and it seems to me that the situation demands that we pass something of this kind with or without the amendment suggested.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I can not yield any further. I want to say to you that in the various European countries farm associations are permitted to do the very thing we seek to authorize under this bill, and it seems to me that America ought not to lag behind in this respect. They are being authorized in a great many of the States in this country, but when they come in contact with interstate commerce they run up against threats that they are subject to prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act. It is necessary for them at least to have some capital on which to do business, and to make some profit that they can save for the purpose of taking care of losses that are always incident to any business, and it seems to me that we ought to give them this right. The provision in the bill that the profit must not exceed 8 per cent is intended to protect the farmers. It is designed to compel the officers of these associations to pay the proceeds from the products of the members to the members, to the farmers. Some of them insist that the dividend should not exceed 5 or 6 per cent instead of 8 per cent. These associations should make money for the members and not for the association. In these days of high money rates it was thought necessary to make the rate 8 per cent, otherwise it might not be possible to get the necessary money to do business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. IGEOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. IGEOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I fully realize in view of your past performances, it matters not what I or any other Member coming from a city may say about the unfairness of this bill, that it will be enacted, but, nevertheless, I can not refrain from calling your attention to the fact that I believe it is the most iniquitous piece of legislation that has ever been attempted to be passed by Congress.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman think the farmers are not entitled to make 8 per cent by holding goods if the present holders are making 200, 300, and 400 per cent in the cities of Chicago and New York?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Why limit it to 8 per cent?

Mr. SABATH. I fully agree with the gentleman from Illinois that the farmer is entitled to make 8 per cent, and I am willing that he should make 10 or even 20 per cent, but I am against his making 50 or 100 per cent. I am not any more against the farmer than I am against any other set of profiteers who are robbing the American public.

I am ready with you, sir [Mr. KING of Illinois], or you [Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi], to vote to-day or any day for any bill that will force and enable the Department of Justice to stop the profiteering that is going on on the part of various combinations and special corporate interests. I grant you that they are manipulators who have made and are to-day making unreasonably high profits, but two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that I am not overstating when I say that 99 per cent of the American people condemn the action of the Wall Street manipulators, trusts, and combinations who have, due to secret manipulations, increased the cost of all commodities and necessities of life. I and many other Members have frequently pointed out the gouging on the part of these profiteers and the thievery they are perpetrating upon the consuming American public, and have urged criminal prosecution against them. We have bills and resolutions pending demanding the investigation and prosecution of the steel, lumber, cement, glass, paper, woolen, cotton, sugar, and many other combinations which you have refused to report, but instead of passing a bill that would put an end to this connivance and robbery you are going to vote for a bill that not only authorizes and legalizes but forces the formation of combinations, not for the purpose of lowering the present high cost of

living or encouraging production, as has been stated by some of you Republican Members, but for the purpose of increasing prices and legalizing outrageous profiteering.

Mr. Speaker, President Wilson has repeatedly recommended and requested that you enact legislation strengthening the hands of the Department of Justice to enable it to prosecute the profiteers, but no action has been taken on your part to this day. Nevertheless every day some of you Republican gentlemen, for the purpose of home consumption, will rise and inquire what the Department of Justice is doing to bring down the high cost of living, but you have failed to give the Attorney General the legislation or the funds which would enable him doing so. It is the Republican Party and the interests you are serving that are responsible and you will not succeed in placing the blame on the President or the Democratic Party as you have planned.

The President has recommended the repeal of war measures, and has recommended the enactment of many reconstructive laws, but you have failed to act. The President recommended the repeal of war-time prohibition, but instead you have enacted the outrageous Volstead prohibition act. The President has pleaded for your cooperation in the adoption of the treaty of peace which was approved by every nation, including Germany and Austria, which would mean peace and happiness to the world, but for political expediency you have refused to ratify same.

Mr. Speaker, by this bill you invite the farmer, the planter, and fruit grower to plant a small crop and secure as large a price as he will choose to charge for any of his product, giving the right to the ranchman to set the prices for his stock and, through the authorization, enter into an agreement with the packers as to the price of hogs, cattle, sheep, and so forth, and they in turn will be at liberty to continue to exact as much for meat and meat products as the public will stand for. You are authorizing the vicious system on the part of the dairymen to sell their milk only to those distributors that will pledge themselves to charge outrageous prices agreed upon months in advance. In fact, if this bill is enacted into law, it will enable the farmers and planters of this country to have the full power to exact any price the combination or organization chooses to charge. I am fearful that the 75,000,000 American people who do not belong to the farmers or other millions will not stand this continuous, terrific increase in the cost of living and will not continue to tolerate this special class legislation, which is so unfair and iniquitous to them. They may sooner than you expect realize their strength and power and drive you from control, electing men who will not be swayed and controlled by special interests or who are blind and deaf to justice, righteousness, and fair play. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have been and am now against special legislation. I have been and am for equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Unfortunately for the people, that principle and policy are not known to the Republican majority now in control, as all they have done, outside of the consideration of the appropriation bills, is to legislate for the special interests. You have given the railroad barons \$300,000,000 of the people's money out of the Treasury of the United States, and in addition you have also authorized them to increase the freight rates 33 per cent, which will mean an additional tax on the public of \$1,000,000,000 a year, or \$10 on every man, woman, and child in the United States. You have legislated for the contractors by making it possible for them to mulct the country of hundreds of millions of dollars. Only the other day you had another bill—which I am pleased I aided in defeating—wherein you endeavored to vote another \$25,000,000 to the wooden-ship builders' combination. On Friday last you passed a bill exempting from taxation millions of dollars worth of Liberty bonds which have been bought up at 82 cents on the dollar by the Wall Street speculators and large banks. Instead of enacting a real bonus bill, as requested by the soldiers, you passed a bonus bill that will come to plague you, and, instead of imposing a tax on the war profiteers to raise the needed revenue, you again place a burden on the masses by imposing a tax on cigars, cigarettes, and tobaccos. You have failed to equalize and revise the war-revenue act.

You have up to this late hour failed to provide a living wage for the thousands of Government employees, who are forced to leave the service, thereby impairing the efficiency of every branch of our Government, and all under the false pretense of economy, following the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy, but hoping that you will be able to go before the people with a cry of economy, when, in fact, for every dollar you have taken away from the departments you have given \$10 to the railroads and contractors of this country.

You may be able to fool some, but you can not fool the majority of the people. They know that the Democratic Party is not responsible for the high cost of living, but that it is due to manipulation on the part of combinations, the money changers, and others, nearly all of whom are part and parcel of the Republican Party, and who, as the Senate investigation into the expenditures of the presidential candidates is disclosing, have already contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to the different Republican candidates and who are ready to contribute millions more for the election. People know that these interests do not expend millions to help to elect a man who would be unfavorable to them, but, on the contrary, before they will let go of any of their ill-gotten fortunes they must have positive assurance that he will do their bidding and give them the protection they desire—and will have at any cost. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I think the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] wanted to ask for recognition.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Commission on the Postal Salaries, appointed under an act of Congress, is about ready to make a preliminary report accompanied by a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that by the rules debate is limited to this bill.

Mr. MOON. I am not going to introduce it now. The Speaker does not understand me. If he will wait a moment, I will make myself plain.

The SPEAKER. Of course, this comes out of the time of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MOON. I am going to take just half a minute in which to make a request. We will be ready in a few hours to report, but we are afraid that Congress may adjourn to-day before we get the report in. It is a matter of importance, and I have been directed to make the report and introduce the bill, and I now ask unanimous consent that we may be permitted at any time up to 12 o'clock to-night to file the report and introduce the bill, and that for the information of the House the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that he may have until midnight to introduce the report of the Postal Commission, and that the report may be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report referred to is as follows:

[House Report No. 1072, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session.]

Mr. MOON, from the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries, submitted the following preliminary report:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

The Joint Commission on Postal Salaries authorized by section 3 of an act approved February 28, 1919, entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," respectfully submits this preliminary report, together with the draft of a bill, to the Congress.

The commission was directed "to investigate the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service with a view to the reclassification and readjustment of such salaries on an equitable basis."

The commission discovered at the outset that various laws contained in Post Office appropriation bills and in special acts of Congress and the regulations prescribed by the Post Office Department affecting the compensation of postmasters and postal employees had not been separately compiled since the publication of the Postal Laws and Regulations in 1913, except as contained in the annual Postal Guide and supplements thereto. Legislation with reference to salaries in the Postal Service has in recent years been amended in almost every particular modifying the method of compensation and the amount paid for practically all classes of postal employees with the exception of first and second class postmasters. Considerable time and labor was expended in the compilation of all such laws and regulations made pursuant thereto and brought to date for ready reference and use of the commission, including the current law, except the temporary increases provided in House joint resolution 151, effective November 6, 1919.

The commission conducted extended hearings in New York, Boston, Chicago, St. Paul, Cincinnati, Washington, Atlanta, New Orleans, Memphis, Kansas City, and St. Louis, at which points employees from the immediate and adjacent States submitted testimony and briefs respecting salaries and the necessity for equitable readjustment and reclassification. Members of the commission have also spent considerable time personally inspecting conditions and the nature and character of duties performed by the various groups of employees in the larger post offices, postal stations, in railway mail cars and terminals. The commission feels that thereby it has been enabled to arrive at more correct conclusions respecting a fair adjustment of salaries in the Postal Service.

For the purpose of the hearings employees were grouped as follows: Carriers in the City Delivery Service.

Clerks at first and second class post offices.

Rural carriers.

Railway postal clerks.

Supervisory officials, including special clerks in first and second class post offices.

Watchmen, messengers, and laborers.

Printers, mechanics, and chauffeurs.

Village delivery carriers.

Special delivery messengers.

Post-office inspectors.
Supervisory officials in the Railway Mail Service.
First-class postmasters.
Second-class postmasters.
Third-class postmasters.
Fourth-class postmasters.

Separate hearings were conducted in Washington for first-class postmasters, officials in the post office inspection service, supervisory officials in the Railway Mail Service, and one or two other smaller groups.

The hearings were confined to employees actually in the service. The various groups mentioned above at each of the points selected their own spokesmen. Individual employees were permitted to and have filed a number of statements in their own behalf. Considerable interest was manifested at the various hearings, which were well attended by postal men and an immense amount of information and data submitted amounting to 2,420 printed pages, which have been helpful and valuable to the commission in the extended study given to the subject.

Early in the investigation questionnaires were prepared and distributed to 14 groups of employees as follows:

1. Clerks in first and second class post offices.
2. Letter carriers in the City Delivery Service.
3. Supervisory employees, including special clerks, at first and second class post offices.
4. Printers, mechanics, watchmen, messengers, and laborers.
5. Rural delivery carriers.
6. Third-class postmasters.
7. Second-class postmasters.
8. First-class postmasters.
9. Terminal and transfer clerks, Railway Mail Service.
10. Railway postal clerks.
11. Village delivery carriers.
12. Post-office inspectors.
13. Clerks in offices of inspectors in charge.
14. Fourth-class postmasters.

The questionnaires called for specific data and information not otherwise obtainable. More than 125,000 questionnaires were returned, which have been carefully analyzed and tabulated. A study of the analyses of the questionnaires discloses valuable and interesting information, worthy of preservation for reference in connection with future legislation affecting the Postal Service. This information will be presented in a subsequent report.

The commission has heard 537 witnesses and in addition a large number of written statements and briefs appear in the printed copies of the hearings. For the first time in the history of the Postal Service its employees and officials have been permitted to present personally their own views and reasons for needed legislation affecting the service.

In a further effort to have the benefit of suggestions from practical experienced men, about 25 postal experts were selected from various groups of postal employees, including clerks at first and second class post offices, carriers in the City Delivery Service, supervisory officials in first and second class post offices, railway postal and terminal clerks, rural delivery carriers, first-class postmasters, second-class postmasters, third-class postmasters, fourth-class postmasters, post-office inspectors, and supervisory officials of the Railway Mail Service.

They were directed to report in Washington on March 29, 1920. They had previously been provided with copies of the testimony presented to the commission, and were directed to submit for the consideration of the commission a tentative schedule of salary adjustments, with proper regard for the relative importance of each group to other groups and to the entire service, together with suggestions for a proper salary scale for each of the various groups of postal employees. This committee was in continuous session, at work night and day, for 10 days, and, with two or three exceptions, submitted a unanimous report, which has been helpful and valuable in arriving at just and proper conclusions respecting adequate and equitable salary adjustments in the Postal Service. This report was thereupon submitted to representatives of some of the groups of postal men who desired to be heard and to officials of the Post Office Department. The latter were invited, and have submitted, along with oral statements, written recommendations and suggestions, both with reference to the conclusions of the committee of postal experts and to the general subject of the investigation.

Hearings were concluded on April 23, 1920, since which date the commission has been in session almost daily in consideration and in the preparation of a salary scale and adjustments of salaries in the Postal Service.

The magnitude of the investigation will be appreciated when it is remembered that the service is composed of approximately 300,000 employees, of which 39,148 clerks at first and second class post offices, 36,105 carriers in the City Delivery Service, 19,202 clerks in the Railway Mail Service, 666 first, 2,538 second, 7,849 third, and 41,645 fourth class postmasters, 42,210 rural delivery carriers, and approximately 5,000 supervisory employees, including foremen and special clerks.

After very careful and painstaking consideration of the numerous questions involved in an investigation affecting such a large number of persons employed in every town, city, and community in the United States and in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Alaska, the commission presents this preliminary report and recommends what it believes to be just, equitable, and liberal provisions in the matter of compensation for postmasters and employees in the Postal Service.

The commission regrets that lack of time prevents the preparation of a comprehensive report with detailed information showing the history, growth, development, and salaries fixed from time to time with respect to the various groups of employees in the Postal Service. In a subsequent final report such information with regard to each branch of the Postal Service will be submitted.

The commission is unanimous in the recommendation to the Congress that legislation should be speedily enacted to the end that the compensation of postal men may be placed on an equitable basis, and if legislation is not enacted prior to the next fiscal year that when enacted it shall be effective as of July 1, 1920.

A number of employees are paid from lump-sum appropriations for whom no specific wage has heretofore been fixed and likewise is not fixed in the recommendations of the commission. When the law shall become effective the commission anticipates that the department will readjust the salaries of such employees to accord with the compensation recommended herein for those with similar and comparable duties and responsibilities.

Statement showing, by grades, the number of clerks at first and second class post offices and city carriers who resigned between July 1, 1919, and Mar. 31, 1920.

Grades.	Clerks.		Carriers.	
	Number in grade.	Re-signed.	Number in grade.	Re-signed.
\$1,200.....	6,070	1,816	2,540	474
\$1,300.....	8,262	954	4,825	309
\$1,400.....	1,952	239	1,219	80
\$1,450.....	1,659	209	1,554	105
\$1,550.....	5,477	339	4,361	228
\$1,650.....	15,780	655	21,502	421
\$1,750.....	4,447	89		
\$1,700.....	172	4	7	
\$1,925.....	3,239	45		
\$2,025.....	201	4		
\$2,125.....	201	4		
\$2,300.....	199	1		
\$2,500.....	73	2		
\$2,520.....	63			
\$2,625.....	39			
\$2,730.....	34	1		
\$2,835.....	25	1		
\$3,150.....	15			
\$3,390.....	10			
Total.....	47,978	4,363	36,008	1,621

Resignations from the Railway Mail Service, July 1, 1919, to Mar. 31, 1920.

Month.	Year.	\$2,125	\$2,025	\$1,925	\$1,825	\$1,750	\$1,650
July.....	1919		1		11	3	10
August.....	1919	3	1	12	6	8	11
September.....	1919	2	1	14	4	6	23
October.....	1919	3		19	5	3	28
November.....	1919	3	3	27	6	11	12
December.....	1919	4	2	14	7	7	22
January.....	1920	6	3	10	3	3	7
February.....	1920			10	2	5	13
March.....	1920	5	3	39	2	15	25
Total.....		26	14	145	46	61	151

Month.	\$1,550	\$1,450	\$1,400	\$1,300	\$900	Joint.	Total.
July.....	9	3	3	44		1	85
August.....	12	1	17	54	1	1	127
September.....	5	3	27	61	4		150
October.....	6	1	35	60	5	2	167
November.....	4		30	48	4		148
December.....	4	1	21	25	2		109
January.....	3		14	24	1		74
February.....	6	1	28	35	3	2	105
March.....	2		31	56	7	1	136
Total.....	51	10	206	407	27	7	1,151

Statement showing estimated increases and the annual rate of expenditures for salaries of regular employees under recommendations of Joint Commission on Postal Salaries, 1921.

Clerks, first and second class offices.....	\$8,665,550
Special clerks.....	654,900
City letter carriers.....	6,837,050
Railway Mail Service.....	4,912,962
Post-office inspectors.....	326,900
Clerks, division headquarters post-office inspectors.....	32,050
Rural Delivery Service.....	5,650,000
Postmasters:	
First-class offices.....	148,500
Second-class offices.....	451,200
Third-class offices.....	1,104,500
Fourth-class offices.....	1,082,000
Village delivery carriers.....	99,750
Assistant postmasters, second-class offices.....	1,013,975
Clerk hire, third-class offices.....	895,750
Supervisory officers, first-class offices.....	2,500,000
Total.....	34,375,087

The additional increases for the succeeding three years will average approximately \$3,700,000 per year.

The work of the joint commission was delayed for a period by the late illness and death of its able and distinguished chairman, Hon. John H. Bankhead, Senator from Alabama, the long-time chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and whose great interest in the welfare of the employees in the Postal Service and in the needed readjustment of their salaries never faltered.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS STERLING.
GEORGE H. MOSES.
LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.
KENNETH MCKELLAR.
EDWARD J. GAY.
JOHN A. MOON.
THOS. M. BELL.
A. B. ROUSE.
HALVOR STEENERSON.
MARTIN B. MADDEN.

STATEMENT OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMISSION ON POSTAL SALARIES.

Clerks at first and second class post offices and carriers in City Delivery Service, five grades: Grade 1, \$1,400; grade 2, \$1,500; grade 3, \$1,600; grade 4, \$1,700; grade 5, \$1,800.

Substitutes, temporaries, and auxiliaries, 60 cents per hour.

Credit for actual time served as substitute in advancement in grades when appointed regular clerk or carrier.

Special clerks, two grades, \$1,900 and \$2,000.

Printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers to be paid and promoted as clerks.

Watchmen, messengers, and laborers, two grades, \$1,350 and \$1,450.

Motor Vehicle Service to continue under lump-sum appropriation.

Railway Mail Service, six grades, as follows: Grade 1, \$1,600; grade 2, \$1,700; grade 3, \$1,850; grade 4, \$2,000; grade 5, \$2,150; grade 6, \$2,300.

Clerks to be in classes A and B: Railway post offices now in class A, terminal and transfer offices to be in class A; others in class B. Laborers in two grades, \$1,350 and \$1,450.

Progression for road clerks to grade 3 and to grade 4 for clerks in charge for class A, and to grade 5 for clerks and to grade 6 for clerks in charge in class B. Progression for terminal and transfer clerks to grade 3 when general scheme distribution not required and to grade 4 when general scheme distribution is required. Clerks in charge to grade 5 in terminals or tours or crews consisting of not more than 19 clerks or in transfer offices or tours in transfer offices of not more than 4 clerks, and to grade 6 in terminals or tours or crews in terminals of 20 or more clerks and in transfer offices or tours in transfer offices of 5 or more clerks.

Clerk in charge is defined as the clerk in charge of railway post offices, terminal or transfer offices, whether alone or in charge of a crew.

In division superintendents' offices all clerks progress to grade 3, four to grade 4, four to grade 5, four to grade 6, and in offices of chief clerks all clerks to grade 3, and one each to grades 4, 5, and 6. Progression for examiners to grade 5 and assistant examiners to grade 4. Substitutes to be paid as grade 1 clerks for actual service performed for one year and appointed unassigned clerk of grade 2 unless sooner appointed regular clerk.

Service of all clerks to be of an average of eight hours per day, 306 days per annum, including allowance for service during lay-off periods. Cash or compensatory time to be allowed for service in excess of eight hours.

Substitute and unassigned clerks to be credited with full time to and from official headquarters to an assignment, with travel allowance while on duty and also travel allowances while on duty on a line starting from official headquarters.

Division superintendents to be \$4,200; assistant division superintendents, \$3,200; two assistants, at \$3,100 each; and one in charge of car construction, \$3,000. Chief clerks, \$3,000; and assistant chief clerks, \$2,500; the heads of sections in such offices to be rated as assistant chief clerks.

Post-office inspectors to be divided into seven grades with progression to grade 5 and after one year's meritorious service to grade 6, and 20 per cent to grade 7 for specially meritorious service after one year's service in grade 6, as follows: Grade 1, \$2,300; grade 2, \$2,500; grade 3, \$2,700; grade 4, \$2,900; grade 5, \$3,200; grade 6, \$3,500; grade 7, \$3,700; inspector in charge, \$4,200.

Actual expenses not to exceed \$5 per day when absent from home domiciles and official headquarters.

Clerks at division headquarters post-office inspection service divided into six grades, with progression to grade 5 and one to grade 6, as follows: Grade 1, \$1,600; grade 2, \$1,700; grade 3, \$1,850; grade 4, \$2,000; grade 5, \$2,150; grade 6, \$2,300; chief clerk, \$2,600.

Substitutes are provided at offices of division headquarters post-office inspection service.

Rural delivery carriers, \$1,800 for 24 miles and \$30 for each mile in excess of 24 miles. Deductions for partial failure to perform service shall not exceed rate of pay per mile per day for 24 miles or less and likewise in excess of 24 miles.

Motor route carriers, 50 miles and over, not in excess of \$2,600 per annum.

Village delivery carriers, from \$1,000 to \$1,200, under regulations to be prescribed by the department.

Fourth-class postmasters, 140 per cent on cancellations of \$75 per quarter and less; 115 per cent from \$75 to \$100 of cancellations per quarter; and in excess of \$100 per quarter, 100 per cent on first \$100, 75 per cent on next \$100 or less, and 60 per cent on the remainder. When compensation amounts to \$1,000 and gross postal receipts amount to \$1,500 within one year, fourth-class offices shall be advanced to third class.

Third-class postmasters are increased \$300 from basic salaries each, the salaries ranging from \$1,000 to \$2,200. Clerk hire to be same as under present law, readjusted annually.

Second-class postmasters are increased from \$100 to \$300 each, the salary ranging from \$2,300 to \$3,000, and the grades according to gross receipts from \$8,000 to \$40,000, reduced from 10 to 8. Assistant postmasters to be in eight grades from \$1,800, with increases of \$50 in each grade to \$2,150.

First-class postmasters to be in 14 grades, with modified schedules in each grade according to gross receipts from \$40,000 to more than \$70,000. Increases range from \$200 to \$300 and \$400 where the salary is now \$3,600 and \$3,700, to \$400 and \$500 where the salary is now \$3,700 and \$3,800, and \$500 and \$600 where the salary is now \$3,900 and \$4,000. No increase is provided where the salary is now \$5,000 and over.

SUPERVISORY OFFICERS IN OFFICES OF THE FIRST CLASS.

The two-division plan is approved for all post offices except those where the receipts are in excess of \$20,000,000 per annum.

At offices of the first class, the annual salaries of employees, other than those of the clerical grades, shall be graded in even hundreds of dollars, based upon the postal receipts for the preceding calendar year at the post office in which they are employed, as follows:

Receipts \$40,000 but less than \$50,000:	
Assistant postmaster	\$2,200
Superintendent of mails	2,100
Receipts \$50,000 but less than \$60,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,200
Superintendent of mails	2,100
Receipts \$60,000 but less than \$75,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,200
Superintendent of mails	2,100

Receipts \$75,000 but less than \$90,000:	
Assistant postmaster	\$2,300
Superintendent of mails	2,200
Receipts \$90,000 but less than \$120,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,400
Superintendent of mails	2,300
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$120,000 but less than \$150,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,500
Superintendent of mails	2,400
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$150,000 but less than \$200,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,600
Superintendent of mails	2,500
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$200,000 but less than \$250,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,700
Superintendent of mails	2,600
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$250,000 but less than \$300,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,800
Superintendent of mails	2,700
Assistant superintendent of mails	2,200
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$300,000 but less than \$400,000:	
Assistant postmaster	2,900
Superintendent of mails	2,800
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,200
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$400,000 but less than \$500,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,000
Superintendent of mails	2,900
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,200
Foreman	2,000
Receipts \$500,000 but less than \$600,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,200
Superintendent of mails	3,000
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,300
Foreman	2,000
Postal cashier	2,600
Money-order cashier	2,300
Receipts \$600,000 but less than \$1,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,400
Superintendent of mails	3,200
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,500
Foremen	2,000-2,100
Postal cashier	2,800
Money-order cashier	2,500
Receipts \$1,000,000 but less than \$2,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,600
Superintendent of mails	3,400
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,200-2,500-2,800
Foremen	2,000-2,200
Postal cashier	3,000
Assistant cashiers	2,300
Money-order cashiers	2,700
Bookkeepers	2,000
Station examiners	2,000
Receipts \$2,000,000 but less than \$3,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,700
Superintendent of mails	3,500
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,300-2,500-2,700-3,000
Foremen	2,000-2,200
Postal cashier	3,100
Assistant cashiers	2,200-2,400
Money-order cashier	2,800
Bookkeepers	2,000-2,200
Station examiners	2,300
Receipts \$3,000,000 but less than \$5,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	3,800
Superintendent of mails	3,600
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,300-2,500-2,800-3,200
Foremen	2,000-2,200
Postal cashier	3,300
Assistant cashiers	2,200-2,400-2,800
Money-order cashiers	2,000-2,200
Bookkeepers	2,000-2,200
Station examiners	2,300-2,500
Receipts \$5,000,000 but less than \$7,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	4,000
Superintendent of mails	3,800
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,300-2,500-2,800-3,000-3,400
Foremen	2,000-2,200
Postal cashier	3,500
Assistant cashiers	2,200-2,600-2,800
Money-order cashier	3,200
Bookkeepers	2,000-2,200-2,300
Station examiners	2,300-2,500
Receipts \$7,000,000 but less than \$9,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	4,300
Superintendent of mails	4,000
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,300
Foremen	2,500-2,800-3,200-3,600
Postal cashier	2,000-2,200
Assistant cashiers	3,700
Money-order cashier	2,300-2,500-2,800-3,000
Bookkeepers	3,300
Station examiners	2,000-2,200-2,300
Receipts \$9,000,000 but less than \$20,000,000:	
Assistant postmaster	4,500
Superintendent of mails	4,200
Assistant superintendents of mails	2,400-2,500
Foremen	2,800-3,200-3,400-3,800
Postal cashier	2,000-2,200-2,300
Assistant cashiers	3,800
Money-order cashier	2,300-2,500-2,800-3,000
Bookkeepers	3,400
Station examiners	2,000-2,200-2,300-2,500
Receipts \$20,000,000 and upward:	
Assistant postmaster	4,600
Superintendent of mails	4,400

Receipts \$20,000,000 and upward—Continued.

Assistant superintendent of mails	\$2,400-
Superintendent of delivery	2,600-2,800-3,200-3,600-3,800
Assistant superintendents of delivery	4,400
Foremen	2,600-2,800-3,200-3,600-3,800
Superintendent of registry	2,000-2,200-2,400
Assistant superintendents of registry	4,000
Superintendent of money order	2,400-2,600-2,800-3,200
Assistant superintendent of money order	4,000
Auditor	3,000
Postal cashier	3,600
Assistant cashiers	4,000
Money-order cashier	2,300-2,500-2,800-3,000-3,200
Bookkeepers	3,600
Station examiners	2,100-2,300-2,500-3,000
Station superintendents to be divided into 10 grades, as follows:	2,300-2,500
4 and not over 6 employees	\$2,100
7 and not over 18 employees	2,200
19 and not over 32 employees	2,300
33 and not over 44 employees	2,400
45 and not over 64 employees	2,500
65 and not over 90 employees	2,600
91 and not over 120 employees	2,700
121 and not over 150 employees	2,800
151 and not over 350 employees	3,000
351 employees and over	3,200

An assistant superintendent of stations may be appointed, as follows:

65 and not exceeding 90 employees	\$2,200
91 and not exceeding 120 employees	2,300
121 and not exceeding 150 employees	2,400
151 and not exceeding 350 employees	2,600
351 and over	2,800

In addition to the number of regular employees assigned to a delivery station each \$100,000 receipts to be considered one employee, and at finance stations \$25,000 to be considered one employee. At stations less than four employees and less than \$100,000 receipts the salary to be not more than a special clerk.

Not more than one assistant superintendent of mails, of delivery, of registry, and cashier shall receive the maximum salary provided, except where the receipts are \$9,000,000 and less than \$20,000,000, where two assistant superintendents of mails shall be appointed at the maximum, one to be in charge of delivery.

In offices designated State depositories and central accounting where the receipts are less than \$500,000 the employee directly in charge of the work to be paid \$200 additional, and \$200 additional for the cashier in such offices where a postal cashier is provided.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

Fifteen days' annual leave for all employees, with pay, and sick leave 10 days each year, to be cumulative for three years, but no sick leave granted with pay for more than 30 days in any one year.

Restoration to grade after reduction in salary shall not be construed as promotion within the law prohibiting advancement of more than one grade in one year.

Payment in money for holiday and Sunday service is denied, and compensatory time for such service must be taken within six days next succeeding Sunday service and 30 days succeeding holiday service.

Promotions in salary after July 1, 1921, to be not more than \$300 per annum, except when appointed postmaster, inspector in charge, or superintendent in Railway Mail Service.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that will not be taken out of my time. I think it is of sufficient importance outside of that. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HUSTED].

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said about the existence of European statutes which permit the doing in European countries of the things which are sought to be done under the provisions of this bill. I have not any desire or any right to question the statement of the gentlemen who have said that exactly the same thing can be done in European countries which they are seeking to accomplish under the provisions of this bill. But those statutes are not before us, and I doubt very much if there is any legislation which allows the doing of this thing in the way in which it is proposed to be done here. And if there is any such legislation, then I believe it is very bad legislation, and we should not adopt it in this country.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. I have only a few minutes. I would rather yield later.

Mr. KING. When you get through.

Mr. HUSTED. This bill is the substitute for the Capper-Hersman bill, upon which we had a number of hearings in the Committee on the Judiciary. I attended those hearings and listened very attentively to the statements of the representatives of the various farmer organizations that appeared there. I became convinced, as the result of those hearings, that the object sought to be accomplished by this bill was not the reduction of the cost of distributing the products, because they admitted that they did not intend to do away with the middleman, but the object was to enable farmers to organize in order to get better prices. That was what they wanted, and that was what they were quite frank in asserting they wanted. They said that the farmers were at a disadvantage in dealing with the men who bought their products, and that this legislation should be enacted in order to enable them to be on better terms in dealing with the large corporations that bought food products. Now, the object of this bill is to enable farmers to associate

themselves together and have a common selling agency. There is absolutely no limitation upon any price they may charge, unless the Secretary of Agriculture sees fit to hold that they have unduly enhanced the price of some product, either by restricting competition or by restraining trade.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I want to ask the gentleman one question there. Is that remedy in the Secretary of Agriculture exclusively, in your judgment?

Mr. HUSTED. That remedy is in the Secretary of Agriculture exclusively. If he does not move, absolutely nobody can move, and the bill does not give the individual, it does not give any association, any right to go into court and have these prices reviewed.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUSTED. Certainly.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Is it not a fact that these men may be prosecuted for combining or conspiring with any corporation to increase prices?

Mr. HUSTED. Oh, they can organize just as big an association as they want, and the bill expressly provides that they may fix prices, any law to the contrary notwithstanding. And that includes not only the Sherman Antitrust Act, but the Clayton Act and every other act that in any way, shape, or manner attempts to control prices.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. May I ask the gentleman if that same argument can not also be made against every corporation?

Mr. HUSTED. No; not that same argument. I am not altogether in love with the Sherman Antitrust Act. I believe that the Sherman Antitrust Act favors big aggregations of capital at the expense of the little man. I do not believe in any statute which puts a shackle upon production. The recent war proved that in order to secure production we had practically to make a dead letter of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and if there is anything that we need in this country to-day to bring back normal prices it is increased production. But I do not believe in class legislation, and I do not believe in taking one class of our citizens entirely out of the operations of the antitrust act and keeping other classes in, and then putting in one man, and one man alone, the power to control the prices of the necessities of life.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now for a moment?

Mr. HUSTED. I will.

Mr. KING. Did not the gentleman vote for the bill incorporating the Edge corporations, which repealed a part of the Sherman Antitrust Act and gave them the right to operate?

Mr. HUSTED. I was opposed to the Edge bill, and I spoke against it on the floor of the House.

Mr. KING. Let me ask the gentleman another question. This amounts to forestalling the market, does it not?

Mr. HUSTED. I do not know exactly what the gentleman means.

Mr. KING. The difference between the farmers being allowed to get 8 per cent and men getting 200 per cent by hoarding wool and food in the city of New York.

Mr. HUSTED. What the gentleman says shows that he has not the remotest idea of what this bill does, because he talks about the farmers getting 8 per cent. The 8 per cent provision is for the protection of the farmers in getting higher prices, and is not in the interest of the public in any degree whatever.

Mr. KING. Let the gentleman attack the New York profiteers in foodstuffs and clothing instead of the farmers.

Mr. HUSTED. All of the farmers have not money enough to furnish the capital stock of these associations in equal amounts. There are some rich farmers that can buy \$10,000 worth of stock, while another farmer may be able to buy \$1,000 worth, and perhaps another who is only capable of buying \$500 worth of the stock.

The bill provides that the association itself, as an association, shall not declare more than 8 per cent of dividends on its stock, and the object of that is to prevent the big farmer, who is able to put \$5,000, or \$10,000, or \$15,000 into the capital stock of one of these associations, from running away with the profits at the expense of the other farmers. But the power of price control of products is vested in the association by its ability to get the farmers together and agree that all the farmers that belong to this association shall not sell their potatoes, or their wheat, or any other agricultural product that the association deals in, at less than the price agreed upon in the association, and the power to sell those products for the common benefit of all is vested in this selling agency; and there is not any limit—any reasonable limit—to the price they could charge unless the Secretary of Agriculture should see fit to declare that they were charging an excessive price.

Now, what are the provisions in relation to that? In the first place, the Secretary of Agriculture has got to give the offending association at least 30 days' notice before he can take any action. Then, after he has taken action, the offending association can still operate for 30 days more and absolutely nothing can be done to it, and then the Secretary of Agriculture goes into court to get an order, an injunction, and that may take 30 days more. So that it is entirely possible that the association would have 90 days, a period of time amply long enough to market a crop, before a single thing could be done to it, and it is absolutely certain that it would have at least 60 days during which absolutely nothing could be done to it to stop it from selling its products at grossly excessive prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am very free to confess that I do not like legislation of this character. I have suggested a number of times to the House what I believe ought to be the legislation enacted to meet the existing agricultural situation. But I do not believe that this legislation is as dangerous as doing nothing.

Let us see what the situation is, and I suggest to my friends who live in the big cities that they ought to get out of their minds just as quickly as possible the idea that the economic problems of agriculture are of concern only to the man who farms. Out in the country live the agricultural producers; in the cities are the industrial producers. Each of these activities is bidding for the energy of every man and for the capital, every dollar of it, in the United States. The man who is running a manufacturing business is doing business, as compared with agriculture, upon a cost-plus basis. He charges into the price of his commodities the labor cost, whatever the price he must pay for labor, and every other item of cost in production. Do not forget that. Agriculture sells its product to the highest bidder in a restricted market. It sells in this sort of market at the price fixed by purchasers. You can readily appreciate the disadvantages of agriculture bidding against industry for any man's labor. The census reports show that, notwithstanding the fact that we have passed the danger line, we are now in the midst of the greatest residential and vocational migration sweeping in from the country upon the cities that has ever been known in the history of the ages.

Now, that means that right behind the problem of the high cost of living, gentlemen, widespread hunger is coming, and no man who has any sense can close his eyes to that. You can not maintain the balance in population as between the country and the city when you have one side tilted up by an economic advantage any more than you can control the level of water in a basin poised on a pivot unless there be equality of weight in the parts of the basin. And let us not forget that population is more fluid in this country to-day than it has ever been in the history of the world.

I repeat, this is not the right way to remedy the situation. But it is not so dangerous as doing nothing. What does this bill propose? It proposes to give the farmer the privilege of organizing and to give, under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, the privilege of operating cooperatively for a profit to the joint venture of not more than 8 per cent, and thereby give to farmers a chance to make more profit than they make now. What is that? It means that we propose to help equip agriculture with the ability to bid sufficiently high for the necessary share of the productive energy of this country to enable it to raise enough food and clothing material to feed and clothe your bodies in the cities. That is all there is in it, and that is the only way it can be done.

It is foolishness to ask the country boy to go back to the farm unless the farm can bid as much for him as the factory bids. You might as well go down and appeal to the waters of the Potomac River to flow uphill, and expect them to do it because you tell them how beautiful the hills of Virginia are. It is all foolishness, and if you folks who live in big cities do not get this notion out of your heads, and if you do not help to make it possible for the American farmer to make enough money to hold his boys in the country against some automobile factory that is bidding to take them into the city, you will see, and that soon, crowds of hunger-crazed people surging through the streets of the big cities crying for bread, and anybody who has good sense ought to know it. I used to think that every big man in the city was a big man everywhere, but some of them are like the cucumbers which we boys used to put in glass bottles when they were little. They would grow and fill the bottle, but there was no cucumber on the

outside. They would just stay there and turn yellow and rot. [Laughter.]

I am not trying to appeal to prejudice. I am trying to appeal to your good sense and to your instincts of self-preservation. I represent a city which largely dominates my congressional district. I represent also a part of the great agricultural section of my State. This proposed legislation is regarded as a farmers' bill. It does deal with an economic problem of agriculture, but it is incomparably of more importance to those of my constituents who live in the cities than it is to those who live in the country. It is more important to those who must have these products to live than it is to those who sell them to get money.

I am not speaking extravagantly when I say that hunger is approaching the cities of America, and even now is nigh unto their gates.

There must be given to agriculture some compensatory advantage to offset the present economic advantage which industry holds by reason of the fact that it can write into the selling price which it fixes all cost of production plus a profit.

I do not like to vote for this sort of legislation any better than you gentlemen who are opposing it. But since you will not enact the measures which I have proposed, we are driven to this alternative. We are close to the gravest sort of food crisis in this country. This bill may provide some protection and help to hold against a worse situation until we can put into operation a real constructive policy which will be free from the criticism of direct class advantage. As a matter of fact, however, under the circumstances, this is legislation directed against a common danger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Swope].

Mr. SWOPE. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the statement made by the gentleman from Texas. It seems to me it is just a question whether this Government is going to have a well-defined policy toward the farmers or not.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of this country are to this Nation what the foundation is to the house. The life, the health, and contentment of the American people rest upon the broad shoulders of the American farmers, who feed them and, to a great extent, clothe them. Yet this great class of people which is the bone and sinew of our land has practically nothing to do with the prices of its crops, cattle, and so forth. The manufacturer buys raw material at the manufacturer's price and sells it for the manufacturer's price. The merchant sells at his own price. But the farmer toils all the year producing his crops and raising his live stock and has to sell not at his price but for the price the miller, the manufacturer, or the packer offers him. That is not fair. The farmers should have the same right to set the price upon what they produce as the merchants, the manufacturers, or the packers, as long as they are fair and reasonable. Under our present high prices some might think that the farmers are in on the profit game; but in proportion to the money invested, the increase in cost of production, and what they have to pay the merchants for what they consume, the profits of the farmers are not large. The question then arises, Why are the prices too high to the ultimate consumer? Simply because of the unnecessary middleman. I have heard it stated on the floor of this House that out of every \$3 paid by the consumer the middleman gets \$2 and the farmer or producer gets only \$1. That system of distribution, although very old, is very objectionable and should be and can be remedied. It is unfair to the consumer, because he has to pay too much for what he needs, and it is unfair to the farmer, because he receives too little in return for his investment of time and labor expended. Mr. Hoover says:

The whole marketing system in many of our commodities is indirect, expensive, wasteful, obsolete, and increases the margin unduly. Our manufacturing industries have developed out of pace with our agriculture, and labor is being drawn in thousands from the farm to the town at wages with which the farmer can not contend.

The problem, then, seems to be to, as nearly as possible, eliminate this intermediate speculator between the producer and the consumer, and then the producer and consumer can share the \$2 that is now being levied by the middle party. The question is, How can this be done? By bringing the producer and consumer together. And then, How can that be done? It certainly can not be done as long as there is no unity of action on the part of the farmers. The farmers must lawfully organize and cooperate if they expect to have anything to say about the prices of their products and bridging the gap between themselves and the consumers. If they can do this, they can both standardize and increase their output and also stabilize their income. The consumer should also be interested in this proposition, because it would mean that the money that in the past has been absorbed in a manner that decreased production would under this plan be applied in a way that would

rather stimulate production, which ultimately means lower prices to the consumers. But there are some legal barriers at present which prevent the farmers from being able to fully organize effectively, and it is for the purpose of removing these barriers that the various collective bargaining bills have been introduced, and this bill, H. R. 13931, has been reported by the committee favorably.

Let us now examine the legal status of the situation and see why legislation along these lines is necessary.

An act of Congress of October 15, 1914, known as the Clayton Act, in section 6 provides:

That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, instituted for the purposes of mutual help, "and not having capital stock or conducted for" profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof. Nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws.

This policy of Congress was again expressed in the deficiency appropriation bill of October 21, 1919, in the following language:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of farmers, producers, and associations of farmers who cooperate and work in an effort to and for the purpose of obtaining and maintaining a fair and reasonable price for their products.

The apparent intention of Congress, however, is not clearly expressed in section 6 of the Clayton Act, and it is rather uncertain what these farm organizations can lawfully do or what are "the legitimate objects thereof." Section 6 of the Clayton Act also exempts only those farm associations "not having capital stock or conducted for profit." The practical operation of that clause is that in States where there is no law permitting the organization of associations without "capital stock" and "not conducted for profit" it is impossible for the farmers to organize because if they organize with capital stock they do not come within section 6 of the Clayton Act, and if they attempt to organize without "capital stock and not conducted for profit," they violate the State laws of these certain States.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWOPE. Not now. I have not the time.

Now, several States have enacted laws making collective sales lawful, but inasmuch as there are many of the producers' organizations whose business extends into several States, they therefore come within the Federal laws, and it is therefore proper that Congress should declare a plain, unmistakable, and fair policy with reference to them.

The Committee on the Judiciary with that purpose in view has very wisely reported out the bill H. R. 13931, which authorizes the association of producers of agricultural products. This bill, in my opinion, will be of far-reaching effect and will be of great help to both producers and consumers. The bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize association of producers of agricultural products.

Be it enacted, etc., That persons engaged in the production of agricultural products as farmers, planters, ranchmen, dairymen, or fruit growers may act together in associations, corporate or otherwise, with or without capital stock, in collectively processing, preparing for market, handling, and marketing in interstate and foreign commerce, such products of their members; and such producers may organize and operate such associations and make the necessary contracts and agreements to effect that purpose, any law to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however*, That such associations are operated for the mutual benefit of the members thereof, as such producers, and conform to one or both of the following requirements:

First. That no member of the association is allowed more than one vote because of the amount of stock or membership capital he may own therein; or,

Second. That the association does not pay dividends on stock or membership capital in excess of 8 per cent per annum.

Sec. 2. That if the Secretary of Agriculture shall have reason to believe that any such association restrains trade or lessens competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is unduly enhanced by reason thereof, he shall serve upon such association a complaint stating his charge in that respect, to which complaint shall be attached, or contained therein, a notice of hearing, specifying a day and place not less than 30 days after the service thereof, requiring the association to show cause why an order should not be made directing it to cease and desist from so restraining trade or lessening competition in such article. An association so complained of may at the time and place so fixed show cause why such order should not be entered. The evidence given on such a hearing shall be reduced to writing and made a part of the record therein. If upon such hearing the Secretary of Agriculture shall be of the opinion that such association restrains trade or lessens competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is, or is about to become, unduly enhanced thereby, he shall issue and cause to be served upon the association an order reciting the facts found by him, directing such association to cease and desist therefrom. If such association fails or neglects for 30 days to obey such order, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file in the district court in which such association has its principal place of business a certified copy of the order and of all the records in the proceeding, together with a petition asking that the

order be enforced, and shall give notice to the Attorney General and to said association of such filing. Such district court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify said order, and may make rules as to pleadings and proceedings to be had in considering such order.

The facts found by the Secretary of Agriculture and recited as set forth in said order shall be prima facie evidence of such facts, but either party may adduce additional evidence. The Department of Justice shall have charge of the enforcement of such order. After the order is so filed in such district court, and while pending for review, the district court may issue a temporary writ of injunction forbidding such association from violating such order or any part thereof. The court may upon conclusion of its hearing enforce such order by a permanent injunction or other appropriate remedy. Service of such complaint and of all notices may be made upon such association by service upon any officer or agent thereof engaged in carrying on its business, and such service shall be binding upon such association, the officers, and members thereof.

In section 1 the bill permits persons engaged in agricultural products, as farmers, planters, ranchmen, dairymen, or fruit growers, to act together in associations, corporate or otherwise, with or without capital stock, to collectively prepare and place their products upon the market. It also provides that no member shall have more than one vote regardless of the stock he may own therein. Provision is also made that the association shall not pay dividends on stock or membership capital in excess of 8 per cent per annum. Section 2 of the bill is to protect the consumer and outlines the remedy in case these organizations should restrain trade or lessen competition. My personal opinion is that the farmers will never abuse the privileges extended to them under this bill; nevertheless I think the committee has acted wisely by staying on the safe side and providing a remedy in case the privilege should be abused.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this bill will not only tend to dignify farm life but will stimulate interest in agricultural pursuits and help stop the influx of the rural population into the cities, and thereby increase production. [Applause.]

Mr. RIDDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request—to extend my remarks on this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, are these remarks all to be confined to the bill?

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, there is no probability, is there, that any of these remarks will be about the bonus bill?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the request to be on this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I make the same request.

Mr. FIELDS. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is better to take them individually. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I make the same request.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have three legislative days in which to print remarks on this bill.

Mr. KINKAID. Make it five days.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; let them work a little.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Wyoming I withdraw it.

By unanimous consent, the following Members were granted leave to extend their remarks on this bill: Mr. PELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SABATH, Mr. WELLING, Mr. UPshaw, Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. WHITE of Kansas, Mr. LAYTON, Mr. SUMMERS of Washington, Mr. RUBEY, Mr. MICHENER, Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. OLIVER, and Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to know if all of these gentlemen who are making requests to extend remarks on this bill are farmers?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is unable to answer the gentleman's question. [Laughter.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of the pending bill. It reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13931) to authorize association of producers of agricultural products.

Be it enacted, etc., That persons engaged in the production of agricultural products as farmers, planters, ranchmen, dairymen, or fruit growers may act together in associations, corporate or otherwise, with or without capital stock, in collectively processing, preparing for market, handling, and marketing in interstate and foreign commerce, such products of their members; and such producers may organize and operate such associations and make the necessary contracts and agreements to effect that purpose, any law to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided, however,* That such associations are operated for the mutual benefit of the members thereof, as such producers, and conform to one or both of the following requirements:

First. That no member of the association is allowed more than one vote because of the amount of stock or membership capital he may own therein; or

Second. That the association does not pay dividends on stock or membership capital in excess of 8 per cent per annum.

Sec. 2. That if the Secretary of Agriculture shall have reason to believe that any such association restrains trade or lessens competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is unduly enhanced by reason thereof, he shall serve upon such association a complaint stating his charge in that respect, to which complaint shall be attached, or contained therein, a notice of hearing, specifying a day and place not less than 30 days after the service thereof, requiring the association to show cause why an order should not be made directing it to cease and desist from so restraining trade or lessening competition in such article. An association so complained of may at the time and place so fixed show cause why such order should not be entered. The evidence given on such a hearing shall be reduced to writing and made a part of the record therein. If upon such hearing the Secretary of Agriculture shall be of the opinion that such association restrains trade or lessens competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is, or is about to become, unduly enhanced thereby, he shall issue and cause to be served upon the association an order reciting the facts found by him, directing such association to cease and desist therefrom. If such association fails or neglects for 30 days to obey such order, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file in the district court in which such association has its principal place of business a certified copy of the order and of all the records in the proceeding, together with a petition asking that the order be enforced, and shall give notice to the Attorney General and to said association of such filing. Such district court shall thereupon have jurisdiction to affirm, set aside, or modify said order, and may make rules as to pleadings and proceedings to be had in considering such order.

The facts found by the Secretary of Agriculture and recited as set forth in said order shall be prima facie evidence of such facts, but either party may adduce additional evidence. The Department of Justice shall have charge of the enforcement of such order. After the order is so filed in such district court, and while pending for review, the district court may issue a temporary writ of injunction forbidding such association from violating such order or any part thereof. The court may upon conclusion of its hearing enforce such order by a permanent injunction or other appropriate remedy. Service of such complaint and of all notices may be made upon such association by service upon any officer or agent thereof engaged in carrying on its business, and such service shall be binding upon such association, the officers, and members thereof: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this section shall apply to the organizations or individual members thereof described in section 6 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, known as the Clayton Act.

If enacted into law, it would relieve farm organizations from certain embarrassments that may arise at any time under existing laws. While removing such embarrassments it safeguards in the proper manner the rights of the public. While no special prosecutions may have arisen under the existing laws, the probability of legal prosecution prevents farmers from cooperation with one another in the handling and marketing of farm products.

The provisions of the bill are clearly disclosed in the report of the committee, which shows that the dangers mentioned by some in this debate are wholly imaginary. This debate, however, has disclosed the strongest possible argument for the passage of the bill. The arguments advanced in opposition to the bill convince me more strongly than ever that this legislation is necessary in the interests of the farmers.

The statements of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the unwarranted precipitation of an enforced adjournment of the House last Friday evening revealed the existence and nature of the opposition to this bill. It is a challenge from the manufacturing centers against the agricultural sections of the country. It asserts an assumed right on the part of the industrial centers to dictate to the agricultural interests of the country with respect to the methods which they should employ in the management of their own business affairs. That opposition assumes the inherent right of the industrial and manufacturing centers of the country to organize among themselves for the benefit of their own affairs and at the same time deny that privilege to the producers of food throughout the country.

As a Representative of an agricultural district and State I gladly accept the challenge of the gentleman from Massachu-

setts and will promptly join with all the Representatives of the agricultural sections of this Nation to resist in every reasonable way the principles embodied in the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts. He seems to assume that the cooperation made possible and safe under the terms of this bill are calculated to increase the cost of food supplies. I deny his assumption in this matter. Intelligent cooperation among the farmers of the country under the terms of this bill will increase the production of food products to such an extent as to secure reasonable prices in the markets. If the gentleman from Massachusetts means that the farmers must sell the products of their labor to the people of the industrial centers at the lowest possible prices, even at a loss to the producers, while the manufacturing centers are allowed to sell their products to the farmers at the highest possible prices, I deny his right to enforce a policy of that kind even through an unwarranted adjournment of this House at any time.

The action of last Friday evening has clearly revealed to many men in this House the latent purpose to force an "irrepressible conflict" between the industrial centers on the one hand and the agricultural centers on the other. How can Representatives discharge the full measure of their official duties to their constituents and to their country unless they stand together as one man and demand for the agricultural interests of the country equal opportunities and benefits in the open markets of the Nation? This "irrepressible conflict" is revealed by the facts that the industrial centers on the one hand are directly interested in securing the highest possible prices for their labor and paying the lowest possible prices for food products, while on the other hand the agricultural sections are interested in securing the highest possible prices for the products of their labor and paying the lowest possible prices for manufactured articles that they are compelled to use.

Then, how are we as a Nation to find a common ground on which we can all stand and share equally in the distribution of privileges and benefits? This desired and necessary result can not be secured by denying to the farmers of the country the privileges embodied in this bill. The attempted denial of those benefits was clearly foreshadowed in the unwarranted adjournment of this House last Friday evening.

Mr. Speaker, all the benefits proposed by this bill for the farmers of the country have been granted heretofore to the financial, manufacturing, and labor centers of the Nation. Then why deny these privileges to the farmers of the Nation? That denial is unwarranted and unjust. The enforcement of that denial will hasten the "irrepressible conflict" and compel the Representatives from the agricultural districts and States to oppose to the full limit like demands from the manufacturing and industrial centers.

In order that we may ward off the evil day of that "irrepressible conflict," I appeal to the gentleman from Massachusetts to withdraw his speech for repairs and join with us in the passage of this bill, and thus give legislative proof that we are ready to deal fairly and justly with the farmers of the Nation.

The agricultural communities have the same right to organize and manage their business affairs as the industrial and manufacturing communities have to organize and manage theirs. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the river and harbor bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN].

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee on this bill is very clear, persuasive, and conclusive. I would like to have time to show where the agricultural farmers' organizations that have been organized in this country have been of great benefit to the city people, to the consumers of this Nation. I would like to have time to show how they have standardized their products, greatly to the benefit of the consumer, and how, by judicious advertising, they have drawn attention to their fruits and other farm products. I would like to have time to show what the farmers have been able to get under the cooperative associations and to submit in detail figures that show they have not raised the prices to the consumer.

I picked up in my office before I left a copy of the report of the California Almond Growers' Exchange. That triangle that

you see here [indicating] represents what the farmer got before he was organized. It is one-quarter of the price that the consumer paid. The farmer got 25 cents out of the consumer's dollar. The first year after the organization he got what is represented by the second black figure, almost half of the consumer's dollar. To-day he is getting close to three-quarters of the consumer's dollar. They have cut down the tax in transit, and the consumer was not paying any more for almonds last year than he was nine years ago.

Mr. KING. The gentleman means the ultimate consumer?

Mr. HERSMAN. Yes. Now, I would like to discuss what the prune and apricot growers and the raisin growers have done for themselves. Their organizations have raised the price to the farmers and taken away the profits of the middleman, and not until last year was the price increased to the consumer. Under the stimulating influence of increased price, planting has greatly increased. The acreage in some fruits has increased 200 per cent. What does that mean? It means that the product will be greatly increased and ultimately the farmers can afford to sell them for less when the market is stabilized and a price can be reasonably assured by his association. My time is too short to consider these points at length, but I mention them in order to show to the opponents of this bill that cooperative farm associations tend to increase production.

Mr. LAYTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSMAN. I can not; I have but little time.

The greatness of any nation depends upon maintaining a contented and prosperous rural population. Its very life can be measured by the condition of those who till the soil. It is therefore of the greatest importance that any legislation touching the life of the farmer should be most carefully considered, and his interests must necessarily be jealously guarded. To-day the farmer finds his success in business must be governed by the same methods used by others. The economic conditions that have changed the individual to the partnership and finally to the corporate method of doing business can not be disregarded by the farmer any more than they can be disregarded by others engaged in other lines of business. Operating individually, he is helpless and falls an easy victim to the organized operators who deal in his output. The products of the farms of this Nation have been in the hands of the speculator and gambler from the very foundation of the Republic. It has been a most difficult and a very slow and expensive experience for the farmer to realize that in order to succeed he must cooperate with other farmers to achieve success in his business ventures. The very nature of his business and his mode of life has inclined him to act alone and independently, and it is only through dire necessity that he has finally realized that in order to follow his chosen occupation to provide for his family and to safeguard old age that he must adopt modern methods and cooperate with others in the marketing and distribution of his products.

The Congress of the United States when it passed the Clayton Act, realizing this important principle and the changing business methods, specifically legalized the kind of cooperative farm associations that were then in operation in the following language:

The labor of the human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations instituted for the purpose of mutual help and not having capital stock or conducted for profit.

The language is not clear, and the farm organizations of to-day have been subjected to much annoyance and uncertainty because of this fact. The farmer of to-day finds that his associations must have capital stock in order to handle his business most effectively, and this bill is intended to legalize farmers' cooperative associations having capital stock. He is not asking for specific exemption; he is not asking to be considered a privileged class; he knows that in order to compete with others in business he should have capital stock, and he is simply asking this Congress to legalize his organizations that are proving such a benefit to himself and to the Nation. Let me make this point very clear, because it has bothered a number of my colleagues with whom I have talked in regard to this particular legislation. The farmer does not ask and does not want class legislation. Under the law an unlimited number of people can form a corporation and through their officers and managers can set the price on their output. This kind of corporation is considered as an individual under the law. A group of farmers can not organize with capital stock and safeguard their interests, because the law considers each one as an individual entity. The farmer has been legislated against rather than having had extended to him special privilege. The provision of the Clayton Act which permitted cooperative marketing among farmers can not under present business methods

be fully taken advantage of, and this bill is framed in order to meet the situation that the farmers of this Nation are confronted with through the evolution of modern business methods. This Congress found itself in a most embarrassing position when it passed the deficiency appropriation bill. Under its provisions you appropriated \$200,000 for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, but you provided that "no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose of maintaining a fair and reasonable price for their product." It seems to me that such legislation little befits the wisdom of able statesmen. You tell the Attorney General that he must prosecute violators of the law and appropriate \$200,000 for him to do it with, and at the same time you say there is one violator of the law that you can not use this money to prosecute, and that is the farmer.

It seems to me that this is legislation of the worst kind. If the farmer is in violation of the law, you ought to prosecute him and you ought to let him know that you are going to prosecute him. If his associations are necessary to his prosperity and in the interest of the public, then our laws should state that such associations are not in violation of the antitrust laws or the Clayton Act. From the position taken by this Congress the farmers of this Nation have a right to demand the enactment of a law that will clearly set forth their position. If the farmers are to receive continued protection, they should know it. If, on the other hand, they are to be adjudged criminals, the knowledge should not be withheld. After their long struggle they are entitled to know how the lawmakers are going to deal with them.

It seems to me that the right of farmers to act together in the disposition of their products is one of the simplest and most fundamental of their rights as producers. They are not asking for any special privileges and have not received any unwarranted consideration in the past. If anyone considers the provisions of the Clayton Act, as far as it relates to farmers' special legislation, it has already been done and is not the question that is now being considered in this bill. The farmers of this Nation are honestly trying to solve the problem of marketing their products and do not hesitate to accept the provisions of section 2. While supervision of this character has never been placed upon these organizations and the activities and records of farm organizations in the past would not of itself necessitate such supervision, I am persuaded from the viewpoint of the honest farmer cooperator that such supervision should not be resented. It would certainly cause the consumer to have confidence and trust in his organization, and might in the future prevent some group from bringing into disrepute cooperative methods.

The Secretary of Agriculture is at all times familiar with market conditions. His agents are scattered in every section of our country. His department is charged with the responsibility of keeping the Marketing Bureau efficient, and information is always available to him without additional expense. He is interested in encouraging increased production and has an equal interest in seeing that the consumer is able to purchase his food at a reasonable rate. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAYTON. And if there are to be any special privileges in the United States, should not the farmer have the first chance at it?

Mr. HERSMAN. He should have the first show. It is in the interest of the city man—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

By unanimous consent leave was granted to Mr. HERSMAN to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in the allotted time out of the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, 60 years ago men of high and generous opinion entertained radically different views about the most vital essentials of our governmental life. They differed in thought, they differed in discussion, they differed in attempted compromise, they differed even to the death. In the evitable conflict which was brought upon this country, now nearly 60 years ago, after four and a half years of as brave fighting on the part of the North and on the part of the South as the world has ever seen, the god of battles determined the issues of war in favor of liberty, union, and nationality, and

there is no man I take it, North or South, who now does not appreciate the great wisdom of this stern verdict of the Civil War. [Applause.]

American men have marched to victory behind the Stars and Stripes in six great wars, and the present triumph of America is that the grandsons of Lee and the grandsons of Grant have fought side by side to protect the civilization of the world in the hour of its greatest peril. [Applause.] The forces of the flag have never met defeat. The United States of America is celebrating Memorial Day to-day—a beautiful day, a day brought to us out of the rigors and the terrors of the Civil War, but happily its purpose is now extended, and from coast to coast in the United States is recognized the valor of American arms. We pay tribute to the departed of their number with the sweet message of flowers. Self-denial, self-sacrifice, acts of heroism, are all recorded upon this one of the greatest of America's days, and now overseas, we see not alone a sympathetic regard but a recognition of the work of the men of the United States in the preservation of the great fight for human liberties in the world's greatest war. At this time, therefore, it seems to me, in this, the greatest legislative assembly in all the world, that it is meet and fitting to pay tribute to this great American day. Let us say with Webster, that we, the living, in paying honor and tribute to the heroic dead, stand besides for our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country, and in order that America, the unconquered, may remain for all time, America the unconquerable. [Applause.]

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand this bill, it is an effort to give to the agricultural classes of our citizenship special privileges not enjoyed by the rest of flesh. I am opposed to it for that reason; and, contrary to the notion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS], I do not come from a manufacturing and industrial section of the country, where he thinks all the opposition to the bill must originate. The district I represent is wholly agricultural. The fact is that I am a farmer myself. You gentlemen smile when I say that, but if I were to say it where my constituents could hear me, they would laugh. [Laughter.]

I believe that the old rule is still good—equal rights to all, special privileges to none. I do not believe that the farmers of this country want any special privileges. I think all they want is that the law should deny to the other fellow special privileges. This bill, according to my friend from California [Mr. HERSMAN] is not an attempt to give the farmer any special privilege. I do not read it that way, and that is not what the report says. I call the attention of the Members to this remarkable language in the report. Denying that this is a special privilege, it goes on to say—

Instead of granting a class privilege, it aims to equalize existing privileges by changing the law applicable to the ordinary business corporations so that farmers can take advantage of it—

Whatever that language may mean. But there is no question about what this language means:

Instead of granting to farmers a special privilege, it aims to take from the business corporations a special privilege—

And how?—

by conferring a like privilege on farm organizations.

Mr. Speaker, in order to take from business a special privilege, they propose to confer a like special privilege upon the farmer. What is to become of the rest of flesh? Mr. Speaker, this is simply an effort to give to the farmer the right to do that which we deny to everyone else.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Well, I submit. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK. I would not care to ask a question unless the gentleman has the time to yield.

Mr. HERSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman to yield, if he does not object.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Would not the gentlemen permit me, first, to get out what is in my head? Nobody objects to the farmers having these cooperative societies. Nobody objects to their organizing, just as they have organized in California, under the law. The gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN] tells us that the almond farmers have already organized under the law, and that instead of getting one-fourth of the selling price they get three-fourths. That is, under the present law; and he said that if he had more time he could tell us the same story in respect to the raisin growers. We propose now to take the farmers out of the general body of sinners and create a special class for them, and tell them to go to it and that they will not be punished.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I am sure the country will be greatly disappointed. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, it has been said in this debate that the only remedy for a violation of the privilege granted is through the intervention of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think that statement is not warranted and is made under a misapprehension of the terms and effect of the bill. The bill provides in the first section that it applies to those—

who are to engage in collectively processing, preparing for market, handling, and marketing in interstate and foreign commerce such products of their members.

Permission is given that they may organize for that purpose, but it is also provided that they must comply with certain provisions in order to enjoy that privilege. Among these is a provision that they shall not pay dividends on their stock or membership capital of more than 8 per cent. If that or other provisions of the bill were violated by any such association, the bill would be no protection and they would be subject to prosecution under the antitrust act.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the act apply to any except those who have capital stock?

Mr. TOWNER. No; I do not think the provision relating to the limitation on dividends would apply to any except associations issuing stock to its members, but I am not sure about it.

The provision of section 2 is only an additional security against persons organizing ostensibly as producers but in reality organizing for handling and marketing solely for profit. It provides that in any case where information comes to the Secretary of Agriculture he may institute an inquiry, have a hearing, and, if necessary, issue an order against the illegal practice. From this order the right to appeal to the courts is given.

I think I am justified in saying that never was an improper use of a privilege more carefully guarded against than in the provisions of this bill. It would even appear as if unnecessary provisions were incorporated merely to make assurance doubly sure; that the only object and purpose of the bill is to provide that when cooperative effort is necessary to facilitate and increase production it might be authorized and protected. Again, it should be emphasized this privilege is not to dealers or handlers or speculators for profit; it is limited to the producers themselves. It is to say that those who produce the necessities of life may cooperate with each other to furnish more and better food and clothing for the use of mankind. It may be added that in doing so they voluntarily limit themselves against undue profits or any imposition.

The bill is limited in its protective features to those who organize under it who are themselves producers. There is no protection given to organizations which merely deal in or handle such products. There is no protection whatever for a mere trading corporation. The purpose is limited to collective "processing, handling, and marketing" the products of those who are members. Who can say that such organization and purpose is not in every way justifiable? Who can say that it will not be an aid to production? Can there be any question but that such organization will aid not only those who are the producing members but also the ultimate consumers?

In order to provide against excessive profits the associations are limited to 8 per cent dividends. Are the corporations which manufacture steel thus limited? Are the manufacturers of woolen and cotton goods thus limited? Everyone knows that there are literally thousands of corporations doing almost every kind of business which have been and are making many times such profits, and there is practically no limit to their profits except the income and excess-profits tax. In this case the farmers voluntarily place this moderate and reasonable limit, so as to prevent any possible appearance even of profiteering; and yet gentlemen on this floor are opposed to any recognition of the farmers to cooperate in any manner or with any limitation. In my judgment this is both unreasonable and unjust.

It is remarkable that there should be manifested a spirit of antagonism against the farmers by those who represent the cities in this House and elsewhere. The prices of farm products which the consumers in the cities pay are at least twice what the farmer who produces such products receives. This more than 100 per cent increase between the farmer and the consumer represents the unconscionable profits which their own dealers receive and impose upon their fellow citizens. But instead of trying to limit the excessive profits of their own dealers to the detriment of the great body of their own consumers,

these gentlemen blame all this high cost of living on the farmers, and when the farmers make any effort to reduce the moderate profits of these middlemen, or desire by cooperation to increase production to the immediate benefit of the city consumer, the city representatives oppose their efforts.

It would be much wiser if those who represent city constituencies would realize that not only their prosperity but their lives are dependent on the products of the farm. Everything they eat and wear comes from the farm. Every comfort they enjoy comes from the farm. It will not be by opposition to the interests of the farmers that they can further their own interests. It will not be by discouragement, discredit, and abuse of the farmers that they will insure their own prosperity. It should be seen by all that our prosperity and the comfort and happiness of our people must depend upon the cooperation and friendly relationship of all, and that no class or portion of our citizenship can afford to build his own prosperity on the misfortune or discomfiture of others. "One country, one and indivisible," is not only a good political maxim, but it is a wise, economic, and business principle as well.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN]. [Applause.]

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I think the real situation relative to this bill and why, in my opinion, it should not pass is expressed in the words or inquiry of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. LAYTON] propounded to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN], in which he assented, who said if there is a class in this country that should have special privileges, that class is the farmer.

Gentlemen, there was a time not so long ago, as I recall it, when the Standard Oil Co. alone had the honor of being the premier privileged class. Then the distinction fell to the Steel Trust, then to the packers, but to-day we learn on the floor of this House from the supporters of this bill, without blush or apology, that either by divine right or by desire the farmer alone has first claim to the honor and emoluments of the privileged class. In other words, the farmer has become the American aristocrat as well as autocrat.

Now, of course, such a claim is foolishness, is undemocratic, is utterly un-American. And yet the gentleman from Delaware has made that declaration.

This bill is drawn for the protection of the farmer, the ranchman, and men of their class. And while I know all here and elsewhere will bear testimony to the great place they occupy in the hearts of the American people, and if it were not for them it would be impossible for the great cities and manufacturing centers, as well as the smallest hamlet and township to exist, it is nevertheless true that the farmer owes a reciprocal obligation, respect, and consideration to his fellow countryman, for he can not advance and prosper without his aid.

This bill has some very pernicious and un-American features, the chief of which from a legal standpoint, in my opinion, is the one proposing to exempt from the present existing law relating to unfair competition and placing these proposed farmer organizations beyond its jurisdiction.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] has cited to you and read certain sections from the report of the committee in support of the bill. He read you where the supporters of the bill claimed that the corporations with whom the farmers are commercially related as agents or distributors have now under the law an unfair advantage of the farmer.

It is not the purpose of the farmers' organizations to come here or to their individual States and ask for remedial legislation. Oh, no! It is not so much that they complain what the commission merchant and distributor does in violation of the law, but they are asking you, and say very frankly in the report, that they want to be made a partner with them, in so far as they may have equal privileges to mulct the public.

The report itself sets up a defense denying that a special privileged class will be created by the enactment into law of this bill, even before the bill was brought out and before an indictment was made against it. The bill proposes to take from the courts the right of initial proceeding, and vest a quasi judicial power in the Secretary of Agriculture, who alone is the one person to determine whether or not a violation in restraint of trade or unfair dealing is had, and the steps which ultimately may reach a court proceeding consume 60 days at least, and may, as the law is now drawn, consume even a greater length of time. During all these preliminary steps which the Secretary of Agriculture alone may employ, the right to enjoin the offending organization of farmers is denied, and even the embargoing of the product of the complained of concern is denied.

Gentlemen, I have no grudge or ill feeling against the farmer; as a matter of fact I have had great respect for him. I have

never quite agreed with those of his friends and supporters who delight in picturing him as the unfortunate member of our body politic, either in education or finance. It is my observation that he is a smart, sometimes sharp, clever individual, and in most cases well heeled financially; and when you come to deal with him, whether it is for his horse, a load of hay, or for his hundred-acre farm, you will find him on the job and well able to care for himself. I think the fact that he has succeeded in having this bill reported is a convincing argument for my contention for his shrewdness and business ability. I do not believe in special legislation, whether it is for the mechanic, the banker, the professional man, or the corporation; besides being unlawful, it is not in accordance with American ideals and is unwholesome to the growth of American business and industry and a deterrent and destroyer of peace and amity to our people as a whole.

I am opposed to the extension of Federal control where there is no especial need or where, as in this situation, the several States have provided by law for the situation complained of.

The fact is we have sufficient law on the statute books to cover nearly all matters for which we are asked to legislate. The gentleman whose name this bill bears has already sponsored and managed the passage of a bill through this House which to-day has arrayed one class of our citizens against the other, and this bill, if it becomes a law, in my opinion, will ultimately have a similar effect.

Gentlemen, I believe the purpose of taking the farmer from without the jurisdiction of the antitrust and kindred laws is to avoid the scrutiny and evasion of the standards of cleanliness and the reduction of excessive profits, which the thriving communities and large cities in this country find it necessary to invoke under the law, which at present controls the situation.

In the State of New York it is almost unbelievable to think, and yet it is a solemn fact, that when the milk producers in that great State were not attaining the proper sanitary standards in their product, and coupled with this wretched condition, charging an unfair price for their product, with sick mothers and suffering, weak children dying because of the poor quality of the milk and their inability to pay the outrageous price for it, sooner than accede to the demands made by the officials charged with the responsibility of enforcement of the law to correct the evil, these farmers threw into the highways and byways, as well as into the brooks, their milk, rather than sell it at a fair and reasonable price to these people so greatly in need of it.

I am opposed to this legislation for the above reasons, and therefore shall vote against the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, really the great problem of people to-day is probably, first, production, and, second, doing away with the present waste between the producer and the consumer. Everyone who has studied economics must be startled with the knowledge of the immense waste and cost to-day between the producer, either of foods or manufactured products, and the consumer. I do not know how successfully this bill may operate when it becomes a law, but it is an effort to make the producers of food products in the country, through combination and associations, which are necessary in some form, to eliminate a portion or a large part of the present admitted waste in the transportation between the producer and the consumer.

I represent the middleman. But I believe the present system is largely wasteful. While I do not know how far the farmer through association may be able to eliminate this waste, nor do I know whether he or the consumer will make the most out of the elimination of the waste, I do know that the experience of mankind is that wherever you eliminate waste between the producer and the consumer it is to the advantage of both and to the disadvantage of no one. [Applause.] Therefore I support the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am unable to understand or to appreciate the viewpoint of gentlemen who oppose the passage of this bill.

It is not the kind of measure in many of its details that I prefer. I do not think it is as good as the Hersman or the Cup-

per bills. I am, nevertheless, for it because I think it is the best that can be obtained at this time. I am for it because the farmer wants it. I am for it because the best interest of the country demands it.

It will cost the Government nothing, it will benefit the public, and can hurt no one except the man who desires to control agricultural products for the purpose of speculation or profiteering. Its provisions simply enable those engaged in production of agricultural products, fruits, and so forth, to act together in associations, corporate or otherwise, with or without capital stock, in collectively processing, preparing for market, handling, and marketing, in interstate and foreign commerce, the agricultural products they produce. They do not handle the products of others or any commodity which they do not produce.

Some gentlemen profess to fear that such an innocent corporation, born of such humble parentage, may grow into a monster monopoly, restraining trade and lessening competition to such an extent that the public interest may suffer. It is as unreasonable as it would be to expect school-teachers to combine, withdraw their cash from deposit and circulation, and thereby precipitate a national panic. You gentlemen should know better; I fear you simply wish to protect speculation and to encourage nonproducers to act as public distributing agents when some of them would serve the public to better advantage were their energies diverted into other lines of activity.

Some of you who oppose the bill come from sections where monster corporations have grown powerful at the public expense. It might be that your time would be more profitably spent in trying to affect the passage of some law that would force them to pay into the Treasury of the country a portion of the enormous war profit which they have made during the past few years.

Gentlemen, there is no cause for alarm. Your rights are well safeguarded by the provisions of the bill. Should any association restrain trade or lessen competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is unduly enhanced by reason thereof full authority for relief is provided.

The powers asked for in this bill are not unusual. Other governments have granted such rights without detriment to the public welfare. Some countries have enjoyed such rights and privileges for a quarter of a century. They still enjoy them and I have never heard of an instance where the rights of the public have been jeopardized by reason thereof. No one has ever heard of farmers forming such a monopoly as endangered the public good. If they so desired, their conditions are necessarily such that they can not do it.

Under present conditions the farmer who produces our food products sells it for about one-fourth of what it cost the ultimate consumer. The remaining three-fourths goes to the transportation companies and to the wholesale and retail merchant.

This bill provides a method whereby the producer and the ultimate consumer may be brought closer together and whereby waste may be eliminated. You can not eliminate waste without benefiting the public.

Our census reports show an enormous increase in the population of our cities. In some sections our rural population is also increasing, but nowhere in proportion to that of the cities. These conditions so alarm every thoughtful and reflective person that from every quarter there comes the demand for increased food production and the cry "Back to the farm." But, alas, no one returns! Why? You say because the city affords better social and educational advantages. This is true only in part. It is mainly because the mercantile and manufacturing interests of the country are in better financial condition than the farmer and can, therefore, afford to pay more attractive wages for labor.

I am not in favor of granting special privileges to any class; the farmer wants none. All he desires is an equal opportunity with others. He is entitled to this, and we should not withhold it from him. This bill will better his opportunity. Figuratively speaking, it will shorten the distance between the producer and the ultimate consumer. It will increase the net profits of the producer, and it will not cost the ultimate consumer a cent more. In proportion as we accomplish this it will increase production and solve the food problem for our too rapidly increasing city population. He who lives in the city should understand that one of its problems is the problem of the farmer. He is indeed blind who resides in the crowded city and has not sufficient vision to see and to understand that prosperous farms make more prosperous nations.

Mr. Speaker, it should certainly be refreshing to the American public to know that if any organizations are created under the provisions of this bill, there will be no water in the stock except that which falls from the honest brow of labor. [Applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER].

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who admittedly represents a district of middlemen, explain to this House that collective bargaining on the part of the producer would have a tendency to benefit the producer and consumer of foodstuffs. I was tempted to compare his statesmanship with that of other Members who have appealed to Members to vote against this bill on the ground that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], the author of the bill, was also the author of national prohibition. Think of the appeal to men to vote against this measure because the author of it is the author of a bill that some of your congested centers do not like. That appeal has been made twice. There is not any question in the world but that the consumer of foodstuffs to-day is suffering more from the fact that the producer has no equitable or fair system of marketing than from any other one cause, and that the producer is being hindered and stifled in the United States from that same cause no man can deny.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, of course it is perfectly evident that in the short time allowed for the discussion of this bill its principles can hardly be enunciated, much less discussed in such way as to materially impress the membership of the House with its unfairness to the great agricultural interests of the country, especially the cotton-producing section, which I in part have the honor to represent.

The fourth congressional district of Louisiana is an agricultural section, and as a Representative from that district I have invariably endeavored to determine what was to the best interest of the people whom I represent and have so shaped my course, as their Representative, as to protect to the best of my ability those interests.

In doing this I have heretofore had occasion to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the efforts made on the part of those representing other sections of the country to measures seeking to discriminate against the interests of the southern section.

Arriving from home last September a year, I immediately took up the question of fixing a price upon cotton, as there were two bills pending, one providing for fixing the price of cotton at 15 cents per pound and another bill providing for fixing the price at 20 cents per pound.

At that time I endeavored to make it clear that it was not to the interest of the people at large and was an injustice to the cotton-growing section to have either one of these prices fixed, or, in fact, for any price to be fixed upon this staple product of the South.

Up to this time this has not been done. Section 2 of this bill now under consideration, H. R. 13931, provides:

That if the Secretary of Agriculture shall have reason to believe that any such association restrains trade or lessens competition to such an extent that the price of any agricultural product is unduly enhanced by reason thereof, he shall serve upon such association a complaint stating his charge in that respect, to which complaint shall be attached or contained therein a notice of hearing, specifying a day and place, not less than 30 days after the service thereof, requiring the association to show cause why an order should not be made directing it to cease and desist from so restraining trade or lessening competition in such article.

This simply means that when an association of farmers organized for the purpose of marketing their agricultural products, upon seeking to obtain a higher price than some individuals think they should bring, they will be cited to appear before the Secretary of Agriculture here in the city of Washington to show cause why the price is not excessive.

Section 6 of the Clayton antitrust law, approved October 15, 1914, provides:

That the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations instituted for the purpose of mutual help and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations or the members thereof be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws.

This section was placed in the antitrust law after extensive hearings, due consideration, and earnest efforts on the part of those representing agricultural interests to have this provision enacted into law. Since that time farmers' unions have felt free to form associations for the purpose of marketing agricultural products without restraint, and it is deemed just and proper that a person who produces an article will be left in a position where he can place the article upon the market at such

reasonable price as the public generally may be willing to pay for it.

Of course, under the antiprofitteering laws no one is allowed to sell a commodity at such an exorbitant price as to constitute an imposition upon the people.

If, as indicated, this bill shall be so amended as to recognize the right of the farmers to organize into associations not having capital stock or conducted for profit under the Clayton anti-trust law it will be greatly improved but will still have incorporated in it section 2, which provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may require agricultural associations to show cause why they should not desist from restraining trade or lessening competition on agricultural commodities, and if upon such investigation it shall be determined that they are doing so the case shall be submitted to the United States court for trial and determination.

While this bill provides for the incorporation of agricultural societies, and it is contended that it will operate to the benefit of agriculture, still in the second paragraph of section 1 it is provided that the dividends on stock or membership capital shall not exceed 8 per cent per annum.

Why this limitation to 8 per cent? Other business organizations are incorporated with full license to realize whatever per cent they deem proper in paying dividends. It is not just for this restriction to be placed upon farmers' organizations unless similar restrictions are placed upon other organizations.

For these reasons, if for no others, I can not support the measure.

As before intimated, it is my opinion that this investigation providing for the Secretary of Agriculture to make investigation is aimed principally at the great staple product of the South, cotton.

It is not meant by this to intimate that there is any prejudice against the interests of the South on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe that he is absolutely fair and impartial and will see that justice is meted out in all cases presented to him. This is clearly shown in a ruling which was made when the question came up as to quarantining the States of Louisiana and Texas on account of the appearance of the pink boll worm in some sections of these two States. Just as soon as it was known that this question would be passed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture I at once telegraphed, giving a warning to the people in the fourth congressional district of Louisiana that this quarantine would be established unless proper showing was made as to why it should not be. A strong delegation from my district came to Washington and, in cooperation with others from the State of Louisiana and the State of Texas, had a hearing before the horticultural board, at which it was shown that it was not necessary to quarantine these two States as a whole, and the Secretary of Agriculture formulated a plan by which the cotton interests could be protected and these two States be eliminated from the effect of a quarantine against the exportation of cotton, cotton seed, and its products, thus saving financial loss to these States and at the same time benefiting the cotton industry throughout the entire South.

It seems unfortunate that the spirit of sectionalism prevails in certain sections of the country and that a spirit of animosity against the South lingers in the minds of a few prejudiced persons who do not realize that the Civil War has long since ended and the animosities growing out of it are buried in the past. This animosity against our section of the country has cropped out in several instances during this Republican Congress, as is evidenced by the declaration of Mr. MADDEN, from the State of Illinois, on the floor of the House a few days ago, in which he characterized Gen. Robert E. Lee and his compatriots as traitors.

Under the rules of the House the Members have liberties which are not accorded to them in other places.

While this statement met with the reply denouncing it as false, and the word "lie" was vociferously uttered by many Members, it was not permitted under the rules of the House for the assertion to be repelled by physical blows.

The Member of the House from Illinois who made use of this uncalled-for statement in reference to Gen. Lee, the hero whom we adore, is said not to be a native American but born as a subject of England, and being adopted by this country is, no doubt, impressed in a similar way with reference to George Washington, the Father of His Country, who took up arms against England, and after a seven years' struggle succeeded, together with other patriots, in freeing America. He would, no doubt, also stigmatize Washington as a traitor if the occasion presented itself.

This spirit of sectionalism was shown when the woman-suffrage amendment was submitted to Congress. Section 2 of the amendment provides that the enforcement of the woman-

suffrage amendment shall be left with Congress. This was clearly done because it was intended by the Republican Party to provide for the protection of the negroes in the South, as it has always been recognized as the policy of the Government for each State to enact and execute its own laws in matters pertaining to the right to vote, except in those instances where it has been sought to protect the negro.

As a further illustration of the statement above made in reference to the spirit of sectionalism, attention is called to the bill now pending in Congress, which has been reported from the Judiciary Committee of the House and is on the calendar for final passage, entitled:

A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State the equal protection of the laws and to punish the crime of lynching.

That this bill is intended as an attack on the South is clearly shown by the report from the committee, which includes a list containing the names of 74 negroes and 6 white men lynched from January 1 to December 31, 1919. This list gives all these cases as having occurred in the South and not a single one of them is reported from the North, only two being reported from Colorado, one from Kansas, and one from Washington, in the West. I will submit with my remarks a list of these cases which this report claims occurred in the United States in 1919. The report on this bill contains a diatribe against the people of the South, who are charged with lynching negroes for the outrages which were committed upon the females of the South.

This list is as follows:

Lynchings, 1919.

[74 negroes and 6 white men lynched from Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1919.]

Name.	Date.	Place.	Manner of lynching.
Henry Thomas.....	Jan. 18	Grand Bayou, La.....	
Bragg Williams.....	Jan. 20	Hillsboro, Tex.....	Burned.
Sampson Smith.....	Jan. 30	Monroe, La.....	
John Daniels.....	Feb. 6	New Bern, N. C.....	Hanged.
Will Fortner.....	Feb. 14	Bossier, La.....	
Eugene Greene.....	Mar. 2	Belzoni, Miss.....	
Cicero Cage.....	Mar. 13	Tuscaloosa, Ala.....	Cut to pieces.
Joe Walker.....	do.....	Greenville, Fla.....	Shot.
Bud Johnson.....	Mar. 14	Castleberry, Fla.....	Burned.
Sam McIntyre.....	Apr. 14	Millen, Ga.....	
George Holden.....	Apr. 23	Forest City, Ark.....	Hanged.
Tom Gwyn.....	Apr. 29	Monroe, La.....	Shot.
Benny Richards.....	May 2	Hickory, N. C.....	
Discharged soldier.....	May 9	Warrentown, Ga.....	Hanged (burned after death).
(woman).....	do.....	Pickens, Miss.....	
Lloyd Clay.....	May 14	do.....	
Will Moore.....	May 15	Vicksburg, Miss.....	Burned.
Frank Livingston.....	May 20	Scott, Ga.....	
Jay Lynch (white).....	May 21	Ten Mile, Miss.....	Hanged.
do.....	May 28	Eldorado, Ark.....	Burned.
Berry Washington.....	May 30	Lamar, Mo.....	Hanged.
James E. Lewis.....	June 6	Mineral Wells, Miss.....	
Max Smith.....	June 7	Milan, Ga.....	Do.
do.....	June 12	Prichard, Ala.....	Shot.
Clyde Ellison.....	June 15	Abbeville, S. C.....	
Jim McMillan.....	June 18	Furth, Ark.....	Hanged.
Frank Foukal (white).....	June 22	Star City, Ark.....	Shot.
John Hatfield.....	June 26	Woodstock, Ala.....	Do.
do.....	do.....	Bay Minette, Ala.....	Hanged (burned after death).
Lije Blake.....	June 28	Ellisville, Miss.....	Shot.
Lemuel Walters.....	June 17	Tillman, S. C.....	Hanged.
Robert Truett (soldier).....	July 15	Richmon, Miss.....	Do.
Chilton Jennings.....	July 24	Longview, Tex.....	
Argie M. Robinson.....	Aug. 1	Louis, Miss.....	Do.
Charles Kelly (soldier).....	Aug. 5	Gilmer, Tex.....	
Jim Grant (soldier).....	Aug. 15	Clark County, Ala.....	Shot.
Walter Eliot.....	Aug. 20	Fayette County, Ga.....	Hanged.
Eli Cooper.....	Aug. 28	Cochran, Ga.....	
Lucius McCarty.....	Aug. 31	Pope City, Ga.....	Shot.
Flinton Briggs.....	Sept. 3	Louisburg, N. C.....	Shot (burned after death).
Bowman Cook.....	Sept. 6	Ocmulgee, Ga.....	Do.
John Morine.....	Sept. 8	Bogalusa, La.....	Shot.
L. B. Reed.....	Sept. 10	Star City, Ark.....	Do.
Obe Cox.....	Sept. 13	Monroe, La.....	Hanged and shot.
Salvador Ortiz (Mex.).....	Sept. 13	Jacksonville, Fla.....	Do.
Jose Gonzales (Mex.).....	do.....	do.....	Hanged.
Robert Croskey (soldier).....	Sept. 29	Clarksdale, Miss.....	Burned.
Miles Phifer.....	do.....	Oglethorpe County, Ga.....	Burned.
John Temple.....	do.....	Pueblo, Colo.....	Do.
Will Brown.....	do.....	Jonesville, La.....	Shot.
Ernest Glenwood.....	Oct. 2	Montgomery, Ala.....	Do.
Mose Martin.....	Oct. 5	do.....	Do.
Jack Brown.....	Oct. 6	Omaha, Nebr.....	Burned.
Will Brown.....	do.....	Americus, Ga.....	Drowned.
Mose Freeman.....	do.....	Washington, Ga.....	Shot.
Eugene Hamilton.....	do.....	Lincolnton, Ga.....	Burned.
Alex. Wilson.....	Oct. 21	do.....	Do.
Gus Jackson.....	Oct. 23	Skidmore, Ark.....	Do.
Henry Booth.....	Oct. 26	Shreveport, La.....	Beaten to death.
Paul Jones.....	Nov. 3	Humboldt, Tenn.....	Shot.
(white).....	Nov. 6	Macon, Ga.....	Burned.
		Stafford, Kans.....	

Lynchings, 1919—Continued.

Name.	Date.	Place.	Manner of lynching.
Robert Motley	Nov. 8	Lambert, Miss.	Hanged.
Britt Smith (white)	Nov. 11	Centralla, Wash.	Do.
Jordan Jameson	Nov. 16	Magnolia, Ark.	Burned.
Wallace Hayes	Nov. 19	Moberly, Mo.	Shot.
Neville Foxworth	Nov. 28	Madison, Ga.	Do.
Sam Moseley	Nov. 30	Foxworth, Miss.	Do.
E. D. Whitfield	Dec. 15	Lake City, Fla.	Hanged.
Earl Whitney	Dec. 15	Macon, Ga.	Do.
Charles West	Dec. 21	Chapmanville, W. Va.	Shot.
Powell Green	Dec. 27	Smithville, Ga.	Do.
		Franklin, N. C.	Do.

Lynching in the United States in the year ending Dec. 31, 1919, by States.

Alabama (1 white)	8
Arkansas	10
Colorado (Mexicans)	2
Florida	5
Georgia	22
Louisiana	8
Mississippi	12
Missouri (1 white)	2
Nebraska	1
North Carolina	4
South Carolina	2
Tennessee	1
Texas	3
Washington (1 white)	1
Kansas (1 white)	1
West Virginia	2

Total (78 colored, 6 whites)

84

The manner of lynching was as follows:

Burned (1 white)	14
Shot to death	31
Hanged	24
Beaten to death	1
Cut to pieces	1
Drowned	1
Manner unknown	11

Total

84

The alleged causes are as follows:

Member of Non-Partisan League	1
Insulting white woman	5
Altercation with white man	1
Attempting to pull white woman from horse	1
Trouble between white and colored cotton-mill workers	1
Assault on white woman	14
Murder	27
Insulting white woman	1
Shooting white man	7
Attempted assault on white woman	5
Result of race riot	1
Talking of Chicago riot	1
Not turning out of road for white boy in auto	1
Leader among negroes	1
Circulating incendiary literature	1
Misleading mob	1
Boastful remarks re killing of sheriff	1
Intimacy with white woman	2
Found under bed in white man's house	1
Expressing himself too freely re lynching of negro	1
Causes unknown	4
Assault on white man	1
Beating and robbing white man	1
Abetting riot	4

Total

84

A man whose cowardly heart and brutal instincts will prompt him to overpower and outrage a delicate, refined, and modest woman is considered in the South as beyond the pale of the law.

This statement is not made in advocacy of lynch law, but it is made because it is a fact that in the southern country the chivalry of the men is such that they would rather take the law in their own hands than see a lady who has been outraged by a brute forced to go into the court room in the presence of the gaze of spectators who are congregated through a morbid curiosity and there have to recite in detail and live over again all of the horrible occurrences.

There are other ways in which mob violence can be avoided much better than the one suggested in this bill, which provides for the transfer of cases from the State courts to the United States court and for the severe punishment of the officials in whose custody a man happens to be when he is mobbed and the municipalities in which not only the mob occurs but through which those passed who are engaged in the mob. All these cases are to be taken out of the State courts and transferred to the United States courts on trials for damages as well as for criminal punishment.

The better way is for all such cases to be tried rapidly and under a statute which provides for every safeguard of the accused, and the punishment to be swift and sure, as it is under military court-martial. But when the ravisher is allowed to delay his case in the courts and his punishment is delayed, it is

not surprising that the people become impatient and demand speedy vengeance.

About a year ago a negro in the city of Washington—the Capital of this great country of ours—entered the bedrooms of three different young ladies in three different homes in the fashionable section of the city on the same night and attacked each one of them. One of them so vigorously repelled the attack that he killed her outright. For this offense he has not yet been punished, and a strong effort is being made at this time to save his life.

Only this week here in Washington at the Highway Bridge a negro attacked a man and his fiancée, shot the man, killing him instantly, and dragged the young lady off into the bushes near by, and while it is supposed that he will ultimately be punished for this crime there is a strong sentiment seeking to defend him.

How can it be expected with such examples as these, and many others which could be enumerated, that people will patiently wait for the tardy action of the courts and the law's delays in meting out punishment.

The report on this lynching bill casually refers to an incident which happened in the city of Washington about a year ago, in which many white men were killed by negroes, and if any of them have been punished it has not been brought to my attention. They seek to dignify this occurrence by calling it a race riot. Enough has been stated with reference to this, but I do not wish to close my remarks along this line without calling attention to the fact that in the South there is a protection for the negro equal to that accorded him in any other section of the country when he obeys the laws and keeps his hands off of the pure women of the South. This statement is not an argument in favor of mob law, but is made for the purpose of showing why the people in the South in many instances are so aroused to a pitch of indignation and wrath that they do not restrain themselves, and for this reason there should be enacted a law providing for swift and sure punishment for that class of offenders who are usually held to account through mob violence.

In commenting on this antilynching bill, which provides for the transfer of cases from the State courts to the United States court, it is proper to state that it is an infringement upon the rights of the States, and it will not be tolerated with any degree of allowance.

Francis Ferdinand, the Austrian Crown Prince, was murdered at Sarajevo, Serbia, by Gavril Princip in 1914. Austria claimed the right to take part in the investigation and punishment for the offense. Serbia stood back on her right as a State to investigate and punish criminal offenses, and the great World War ensued as a direct result.

There are times that people, although helpless and dependent, will rise up in their might and assert their rights at all hazards, and it is in the defense of these rights of the States that I protest against such sectional measures as the Dyer bill, as well as many similar measures which are sought to be enacted by this Republican Congress.

While 40,000,000 white people died either in the late war or as a result of that war, leaving that many more colored people in proportion, still the white people of this earth are in the ascendancy through their intelligence, religious characteristics, and superior refinement; but we must bear in mind that the numbers of the white race are rapidly decreasing in the proportion which they bear to the colored races of the world, although the white race has doubled in population in the last 300 years, being now about one-third of the population of the globe.

The time may come when the various colored races may decide to combine against the white race, and with their experience when Japan overcame the Russians in that clash between the yellow and the white race, it is to be presumed that they will be encouraged to believe that they are invincible in such a conflict.

The sectional statutes which are sought to be enacted will naturally array the negro against the white man, and if a final clash should come between the races it is evident what position the negro race will take.

In the South he is treated with every consideration. The laws are enforced in his behalf just the same as they are in behalf of the white man. His school and church privileges are the same; his rights of property are respected; but he does not claim or expect social equality. The white man and the negro of the South understand each other and, if left alone to work out their own destiny, will have no trouble in living peacefully and contentedly, and nothing but sectional animosity and an effort to array the negro against the white man will ever cause the negro to rise up against the white man, and I do plead with

the people of the North to lay aside any sectional feeling which they may have and reconcile themselves to the fact that no more loyal, patriotic people live on earth than those in the southern section of this great, united country of ours.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. IGOE. And how much on the other side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Seventeen and one-half minutes remaining to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I want to say that I think I have supported in my service here every measure that has been proposed in the interest of the farmer. The necessity for this bill comes from the fact that in the Clayton Act the exemption is for cooperative associations without capital and not organized for profit but for the mutual benefit of the members. It was stated to the committee that the purpose in coming before them was to ask that the restriction against capital stock be removed, and if that was the question that was presented to this House to-day, then you would have the real question that is at issue between the farmers and the Government officials who are seeking to enforce the present law.

There has not been before the committee a representative who upon cross-examination was willing to admit that the farmers wanted anything more than the privilege of having capital stock in their cooperative associations. I say to this House if you want to meet that proposition all you have to do is to amend the section of the Clayton Act and strike out the words "without capital stock" and you have met it. But there are interests in this country who are hiding behind the farmers, and for some reason or other they have in their behalf the aid of the representatives of the farmers here in Washington. I believe the people who oppose the bill are more the friends of the farmer than those who are supporting it.

Now, what is the situation? If you will examine this bill, you will find in section 1 a provision which says:

And such producers may organize and operate such associations and make the necessary contracts and agreements to effect that purpose, any law to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now, what was the situation in the California cases? It was that these associations when organized went out in competition with other business and other individuals, and sought to violate every law upon the statute books. They sought to put every competitor out of the business by price agreements. They sought to put them out of business by various unfair means and methods, and, finding themselves against the law, they come now and ask for this proposition. But when the attorney who represented them was before the committee and this proposition was put up to him plainly and he was asked whether he wanted that provision in the Harsman law, which has been incorporated in this, he said, "No; we do not. We want the right to have capital stock, and if we have that we are willing to abide by their law."

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. No; I regret to say I can not yield.

Here is the proposition: It is not to allow these farmers to cooperate and have capital stock. It is to allow them, after they are incorporated, to go out and do anything which any other corporation or individual can not do. Now, what is the effect of it? Take, for instance, the milk situation in the big cities. These people now have their cooperative associations without capital stock, but if they get this they can violate the laws against unfair trade, and they can go to the people who deliver the milk and say, "We will sell you our milk, but on condition that you handle our milk exclusively. If you handle any other we will not sell to you." And they can control the prices the distributor may charge. They can say to the distributor, "We will allow you to sell our milk, but you must charge a certain price and give us a certain price." And so the big packers of this country under this law, if they desire to do it, could organize the ranchmen of the country and say to them, "Now, we will distribute your product and make an agreement as your agent to charge a certain price," and under this law they are absolutely free from every law on the statute books—the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the laws against unfair competition—and can go out in the country and take from the consumers as much as they want.

Let me tell you another thing, you friends of the farmer: If you get one of these cooperative associations in your country they can go to the farmers who do not want to come in and say to them, "If you do not come in we will break you." And I will tell you now that they are doing it in some of the States. They are doing it in the State of Michigan, where the beet farmers have gotten together—

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. IGOE. No; I can not yield.

Mr. SABATH. I want to say that what the gentleman said is true.

Mr. IGOE. I have been informed that unless they sell upon the terms of the association they have been threatened, and the gentleman can deny it in his own time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOCHT. I understand that in the process of this legislation there will be an opportunity whereby the producer will receive some measure of protection from what might now be characterized as the biggest grafters in America, the commission merchants of New York, Philadelphia, and other cities. Nearly every Member of Congress has received word from home, from those who go among the farmers and gather up produce and send it to the cities, that they fail to get any return, and we have been overwhelmed and besieged and importuned to relieve this condition.

That is one phase of it. Another phase is the protection that the consuming public will have with respect to the products of the farm. Notwithstanding the fact that we have cold storage everywhere, the farmers, or this combination, this union, whatever it is, or whatever you call it, will not be able to so conserve the products as to fix the price to an inordinate amount, for the reason that nearly everything, in fact, everything that is produced on the farm is perishable, and the first thing that a farmer wants is a market. He must sell his product, in order to get anything, at least some time during the year. Therefore he must dispose of his products, and the people will have in that one point and feature of the bill ample protection from any such thing as profiteering on the one hand, while on the other there will be no more grafting of the huckster such as has recently been carried on by the commission men, commission merchants of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Cleveland, Buffalo, Chicago, St. Louis, in fact, every city, by no means excepting Washington. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. UPSHAW].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for one minute.

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the declaration during this debate that agriculture is the basic industry of the world should find a companion truth in the declaration that the principle of collective bargaining by workers and producers is the basis of a square deal for both labor and capital.

I have the honor of representing the greatest city of the Southeast. I enter into every business man's legitimate purposes and rejoice in his legitimate success. But it is as clear as the light that if merchants and manufacturers and bankers have the right to assemble their capital in order that they may buy and sell and get gain, if the workingman in the city has the righteous right to assemble his only capital of the horns on his hands and the sweat on his brow to better his condition—and no man dare deny him that right—then surely the farmer, who works from daylight to dark to feed and clothe the world, must have the same right. [Applause.]

LEGISLATING FOR RURAL HAPPINESS.

My chief reason for being in favor of this legislation in behalf of farmers is because I want to see everything done for the farmer that can possibly be done to encourage agricultural life. I want to see farm life made so attractive from every angle that the stalwart young manhood of America will be glad to elect the farm as a life vocation. The drift from the farm to the congestion of city life is a dangerous, an almost fatal tendency in our American life. Production must be increased or the high cost of living will never come down. The world must be fed, the world must be clothed, and the ever-increasing demand for these necessities that must come first-hand from the soil furnishes the basis of a marvelous prosperity for the man who determines to dedicate his energy, his enterprise, his informed genius to the many-sided opportunities of farm life.

STANTON SAYS, "STICK TO THE FARM."

So appalling is the need of greater production and so fraught with danger is the desertion of the farm for the congestion of the city that thoughtful, farseeing men are gravely concerned. The patriotic question is asked on every side, "How shall we

remedy the situation? What can be done by legislation or by general education to hold the purposeful youth of to-day on the farm? And what can be done to turn the tide of millions in the city back to the farm—literal millions who freeze in winter, faint in summer, and live from hand to mouth all the time?"

Certainly if these improvident millions who must be fed and clothed can not be induced to go to the farm and share the prosperity that would come from helping to feed and clothe the world, then it is an economic and a highly patriotic duty to legislate and educate in every possible way to make the sons and daughters of the soil "stick to the farm" and develop the farm more and more unto the fundamental prosperity of the individual and the Nation.

Frank L. Stanton, Jr., of Atlanta, the gifted son of Georgia's beloved poet-laureate, the James Whitcomb Riley of the South, has inaugurated a thoroughly unique and workable plan of educational advertising, entitled "Stick to the farm."

It is suggested by him that the Department of Agriculture take charge of the movement and go after every conceivable agency in America to boost the campaign until the slogan, "Stick to the farm," articulates from every wayside fence and stump and stone and flash in blazing letters from the "burnished ceiling of the sky."

Thus the dangerous drift from the country to the city will be arrested, and by proper education, legislation, industry, and enterprise the farmer will indeed "make two grass blades grow where one was growing before" and gardens of roses shall blossom where thorns and thistles erstwhile grew. And thus the agricultural prosperity of the country will put its soothing hand on the fevered pulse of national unrest, sending from the happiness and contentment of rural life the inspiration of its schools and the purity and warmth of the "old-time religion" of its progressive country churches that splendid, God-fearing citizenship which must be the safety of America and the hope of all mankind.

DEMOCRACY AND CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION.

This argument growing out of my lifetime interest in the farmer—for I was born on a farm and chiefly reared between the plowhandles—ties itself naturally to my interest and pride in the constructive legislation of the Democratic Party.

This is not said in a narrow sense, but out of simple loyalty not only to the party of my fathers but to what I honestly conceive to be the fundamental principles of Democracy and good government.

It was a notable thing that lifelong Republicans like Henry Ford and Thomas A. Edison declared in 1916 that the Democratic Party, under the first four years of President Wilson's administration, had put more laws on the statute books that really reached and helped humanity than the Republican Party had enacted during its whole lifetime, and for that reason they left their lifelong Republican affiliations and gave substantial and enthusiastic support to the Democratic ticket. And, as a matter of information and history, I give here an epitome of some of the notable and practical legislation of which the Democratic Party is justly proud and for which the whole country, irrespective of political lines, should be grateful:

CONSTRUCTIVE LEGISLATION.

1. Currency reform: By the enactment of the Federal reserve act the industrial and commercial interests of the United States have been emancipated by Democratic agency from domination by special interests. The Nation was freed from the danger of financial panics and the foundation laid for the existing wonderful prosperity of the country.

2. Rural credits: The passage of the Federal farm-loan act remedied an imperative need entirely ignored by the Republicans for years and assures adequate means of providing capital at fair rates of interest for the further development of the agricultural resources of the United States and promises an annual saving to farmers of \$150,000,000 a year.

3. Good roads: In the new Federal good-roads law, approved by the President last July, the Democratic administration makes available \$75,000,000 for the development of highway systems throughout the United States under safeguards which prevent wasteful use of the money.

4. Tariff revision downward: In keeping with the platform pledge of 1912 the Democratic Party revised the tariff downward and put the Underwood tariff law upon the statute books, thus unfettering industry and commerce, depriving monopoly of its former control over production, distribution, and prices, and providing adequate customs revenue for the maintenance of the Government.

5. Income tax: The income-tax law, opposed by the Republican Party for a generation, shifts the burden of taxation from those least able to pay to those best able to pay.

6. Tariff commission bill: In this measure creating a tariff commission the Wilson administration takes an important step toward eliminating the tariff from politics and affords assurance of protection to American manufacturers against any emergency which may follow the close of the war in Europe.

7. War revenue: To meet the cost of "preparedness" the Wilson program increases the income tax, provides for an inheritance tax, and levies a special tax upon munitions of war. Many Republican Members of Congress have voted for this plan.

8. The Federal Trade Commission: This new commission in the year and one-half of its operation with signal success has supplied

the demand for a tribunal to arbitrate commercial disputes, to prevent "unfair competition," and to do justice between the public and the great industrial corporations.

9. Direct election of United States Senators: A reform inspired and carried into effect by Democrats, which does much to restore popular Government at Washington.

10. Seamen's act and safety at sea: By a series of laws, chief of which is the seamen's act, working conditions of sailors in the American merchant service are improved and precautions are taken to avoid the fearful loss of life at sea that accompanied the *Titanic* disaster.

11. Revision of trust laws: In the face of persistent opposition of the special interests and at a time when the greatest international questions press upon the President and Congress, a complete revision of the antitrust laws was secured and is now in force.

12. Agricultural extension: Under the Smith-Lever agricultural extension act elaborate machinery has been put into operation by Woodrow Wilson that involved the expenditure of nearly \$5,000,000 during the last fiscal year, a sum which will increase automatically year by year until 1922, for the dissemination of scientific knowledge concerning farm operation and management. This law is expected to double the productivity of American farms.

13. Workmen's compensation: A model measure has passed both Houses and will extend this protection to thousands of Government employees.

14. Labor's magna charta: Laws have been enacted preventing the abuse of the injunction in labor disputes and legally declaring the labor of a human being not a commodity open to barter and sale like inanimate things.

15. Child labor law: President Wilson's personal intervention brought about the enactment of this important social-justice measure, which uses the Federal power to emancipate children from industrial oppression.

16. Eight-hour day: To the laws passed by the Democratic majority of the House in the Sixty-second Congress applying the eight-hour day to all work done by the Government, whether directly or by contract, has been added the act requiring the eight-hour workday for women in the District of Columbia.

17. Industrial employees' arbitration act: A law secured by the President that establishes the United States Board of Mediation and Conciliation and affords the Government better facilities for preventing or settling great railway and industrial strikes.

18. Cotton futures act: Gambling in cotton is dealt a death blow by a cotton futures law enacted by Democrats after the subject had been evaded by Republicans for two decades.

19. Grain standards: A law giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to establish official grain standards, simplifying relations between grain producers, dealers, and consumers, was enacted last August.

20. United States warehouse act: Warehouse receipts are made more acceptable collateral, which enables owners of stored products to obtain loans more nearly approximating the full value of their products.

21. Parcel post: This service has broken up an extortionate monopoly by private express companies and has been developed from a mere shell to the most gigantic, useful, and far-reaching express service in the world.

Gentlemen, you might as well "shell down the corn." That is a list of wholesome legislative achievements that will forever crown the Democratic administration that enacted them with a halo of statesmanship and practical humanitarian sympathy in action.

And then came the Great War, which we rightly tried so hard to avoid, but from which we could no longer hold ourselves aloof and preserve our national safety and our international prestige and honor. Under Democratic guidance it was a common challenge and a common victory. Let us thank God for the wonderful victory and face the burden and the future like patriotic Americans. [Applause.]

Mr. UPSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for one minute.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the chairman of the committee will offer an amendment, which I would like to take the minute in saying, in my opinion, will greatly improve the bill and render it more acceptable to the friends of the agricultural interests; and I mean by the friends of the agricultural interests those who recognize the paramount importance of doing everything properly within the scope of legislation that is possible to stimulate and encourage agricultural production.

At some future time I shall ask the privilege of addressing the House on that subject, which is of as much interest to me as any subject the House can consider. Meanwhile, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for half a minute.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may give my reasons in support of this measure, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for one minute.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration, H. R. 13931, is designed to promote the interests of the farmers of the country by vesting in them the legal right to form associations for the marketing of their products, a privilege that is denied them under present laws. The bill is therefore correct in principle, and should receive the support of every Member of the House.

The committee's report on the bill reads as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13931) entitled "A bill to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," having considered the same, report it with the recommendation that it do pass.

The object of this bill is to authorize the producers of agricultural products to form associations for the purpose of collectively preparing for market and marketing their products.

Section 1 defines and limits the kind of associations to which the legislation applies. These limitations are aimed to exclude from the benefits of this legislation all but actual farmers and all associations not operated for the mutual help of their members as such producers. Unless each member has but one vote in his association, irrespective of the amount he may have invested as capital therein, the association must not pay a dividend of to exceed 8 per cent per annum. This limitation of 8 per cent is designed to compel payment to the members of as large a part of the proceeds derived from the sale of their products as possible, instead of paying it as a dividend upon the money used as capital. A number of farm associations oppose the payment of any dividend on capital, while others insist that they need a capital and must have the privilege of paying dividends. Eight per cent was fixed for the reason that in many places money can not be borrowed at a less rate, and that hence a less rate would prevent some of these associations from obtaining the necessary funds to carry on their business. The aim has been to make the provisions of the bill sufficiently liberal so that all cooperative farm associations operated in good faith for the benefit of their members might avail themselves of the provisions of this bill. The bill does not, however, compel any association to change its present organization nor does it create any new organizations. Associations will continue to be formed under State laws as heretofore. In States where it is illegal to operate an association such as the ones permitted under this bill, it will, because of the nature of such associations, be practically impossible to operate under this legislation, as the bill only grants the right to operate in interstate and foreign commerce. That is the only power that Congress can confer upon such associations.

Section 2 makes applicable to these associations in a modified form the provisions of the Clayton Act. Briefly, it gives the Secretary of Agriculture power to prevent these associations from exploiting the public. In the event that any association should refuse to comply with the order of the Secretary, a suit may be brought in the appropriate district court to enforce his order. The farmers are not asking a chance to oppress the public, but insist that they should be given a fair opportunity to meet business conditions as they exist—a condition that is very unfair under the present law. Whenever a farmer seeks to sell his products he meets in the market place the representatives of vast aggregations of organized capital that largely determine the price of his products. Personally he has very little, if anything, to say about the price. If he seeks to associate himself with his neighbors for the purpose of collectively negotiating for a fair price he is threatened with prosecution. Many of the corporations with which he is compelled to deal are each composed of from thirty to forty thousand members. These members collectively do business as one person. The officers of the corporation act as agents of these members. This bill, if it becomes a law, will allow farmers to form like associations, the officers of which will act as agents for their members.

While this bill confers on farmers certain privileges, it can not properly be said to be class legislation. Business corporations have under existing law all the powers and privileges sought to be conferred on farm organizations by this bill. Instead of granting a class privilege, it aims to equalize existing privileges by changing the law applicable to the ordinary business corporations so the farmers can take advantage of it. Instead of granting to farmers a special privilege, it aims to take from the business corporations a special privilege by conferring a like privilege on farm organizations. It is no answer that farmers may acquire the status and secure the rights of a business corporation by deeding their farms to a corporation. That is neither practical nor desirable from any standpoint. Without doing that they can not associate themselves together for the mutual profit of the members without being threatened with prosecution.

New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and a number of other States have granted the right to form associations such as those contemplated in this bill. But these States can not confer any right upon their organizations to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. This bill is designed to grant that right. Associations of this kind are common in European countries and have been in operation for many years. Their effect has not been to raise prices to the consumer. In many instances the effect has been the reverse. They have tended to prevent much of the gambling in foodstuffs and to eliminate many of the useless middlemen that stand between the producers, the retailers, and the consumers. It is one of the chief problems of these associations to reach the consumer with as little expense as possible. Farmers ought to be given a chance to do that. The high cost of living can not be solved by discouraging agriculture. It must be solved by fair treatment of those engaged in that pursuit. To maintain his self-respect and the dignity of his occupation the farmer must be given an opportunity to deal in selling his products on an equal footing with those who purchase them. He should be given an opportunity to help solve in a rational and fair way the problems involved in the high cost of living.

The report, Mr. Speaker, fully explains each provision of the bill. As will be noted, the first section of the bill provides for

the association of producers for the marketing of their products, which will give them protection against the gamblers in agricultural products, who rob the producer with one hand and the consuming public with the other. It also provides that the association shall not earn a dividend in excess of 8 per cent, which will protect all the members of an association against the possibility of a few of its officials getting control of it and consuming the profits to which the farmer is entitled by paying to themselves exorbitant salaries for conducting the business of the association.

Section 2 of the bill safeguards the interest of the public by giving to the Secretary of Agriculture power to go into the courts to prevent an association from exploiting the public, should an association decide to do so. Therefore, both the producers and the consumers are protected in their legitimate rights by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest menace with which the farmer is confronted to-day is the gambler in agricultural products, who plays no part in nor contributes to the production of those products. The greatest evil with which the consuming public is confronted is the profiteer, who exacts exorbitant profits upon the necessities which the public must consume. The country is suffering more to-day as a result of these two evils than from all other evils combined, and they should be corrected by legislation as far as it is possible to correct them in that way.

The President requested the Congress some ten months ago to immediately enact legislation to curb the profiteers and gamblers in food products and other necessities of life, who had become entrenched by war conditions, but his request was ignored by the majority party in Congress, which controls the legislative policy of both branches of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I venture the assertion, and do it without fear of successful contradiction, that if the Republicans in both branches of Congress, who have a majority in each branch, had devoted half the time to legislation designed to prevent gambling in agricultural products on the one hand and profiteering in the finished products on the other that they have spent in investigating and criticizing the President and the conduct of the war, all of which was done for their political advantage, the gambler in agricultural products and the profiteer in the necessities of life would to-day be out of business so far as it is possible to put them out of business by the enactment and enforcement of law. Of course, everyone understands that it is impossible to enact any law that will totally prevent the commission of crime. Some men will commit infractions of the law regardless of the penalties for such infractions.

We have statutes against pistol toting, with penalties for violations of its provisions, but yet men carry pistols. We have statutes against murder, manslaughter, and assault and battery, and so forth, with severe penalties for the commission of those acts, yet men commit such acts. But they are not committed so frequently and so dastardly as they would be in the absence of any statute prohibiting the commission of such acts and punishing those who do so.

The bill under consideration, however, is a step in the direction requested by the President nearly a year ago, and I commend the Committee on the Judiciary for taking that step by framing and reporting to the House this bill. I only regret that we have not been given an opportunity to consider and pass other bills necessary to cure other evils in our economic system that have grown out of war conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the effects of this bill, if it becomes a law, will not be temporary, nor will its benefits be confined to the producers and consumers of the products that will be sold through the associations which the bill authorizes, but it will contribute to the life and prosperity of the Nation by increasing the production of the soil by providing for the tillers of the soil better and safer markets for their products. History will bear me out in the assertion that no nation ever ceased to exist as a nation except for one of two causes—first, by being overrun and subjugated by a superior power, or, second, by failure to produce from the soil the things essential to the life of its people. Therefore that which will increase the production of the soil is not alone of importance to the tillers of the soil but is of interest to the Nation as a whole, first, from an economic standpoint, and, last, but not least, by contributing to the life of the Nation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOW] desire to use the balance of his time?

Mr. IGOW. How much time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. IGOW. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I regret—coming from a great productive region, as I do, where my people are farmers and where a bill like this is offered on the floor of this House which is said to be a bill in the interest of farmers—that I can not see in the bill that there is anything on which the farmer may depend for any relief from the present conditions. This is, so far as the matter of government is concerned, a piece of class legislation, group legislation, pure and simple.

I have always adhered to the belief, and still adhere to the belief, that the great agricultural masses of this country do not want any special privileges, and they do not want the other fellow to have any. [Applause.] I have always felt that when the testing day came to this Nation as to whether or not it would be overthrown by virtue of legislation for groups of people and combinations of groups we should look back to the great agricultural masses which stand back there and hear them say, "We have never demanded a special privilege for ourselves, and we are going to fight special privileges to others." This bill violates that principle, and we have got to look to the farmers of this country to protect the Nation in the years to come.

Now, what does this bill do? Take section 2, where you put your power in one man. If he is a good man, he might not abuse that power; but it is a man that you are reposing upon and intrusting the power to. The Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to determine the proposition as to whether farmers are combining to profiteer in wheat, cotton, or other agricultural products. That is a power that ought not to be put in a governmental agency. It is a safe rule not to vest such a power by statute; and yet you are vesting that power here in the Secretary of Agriculture, a power over the destiny of the farmers of this Nation.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Let me show you where you are putting yourselves. I represent a section that clothes the world.

Cotton is the great crop in my section. Other gentlemen here come from sections where grain is produced. Both of these great crops—cotton and grain—are more or less affected by the operation of the cotton exchanges and the grain exchanges. If I were a gambler on the cotton exchange I would ask you to give this power to the Secretary of Agriculture and let there be an organization formed to handle the cotton crop. Ah, how I would lay my plans if I were a gambler on one of those exchanges, and I would come to the Secretary of Agriculture, and I would hold the cotton farmers of the South up to scorn, and I would demand a hearing, and I would have everybody who wanted to consume cotton up in the air. Nobody would know what this man to whom you give this power is going to do, or what effect it will have on the men who are growing cotton in Texas. They have no market. It destroys their market. The same would be true as to wheat and as to every other great agricultural product, and when you write it on the statute books of the country you are giving the farmer additional trouble to deal with. If this is the last vote I ever cast on a great, important agricultural proposition, my vote shall be cast against giving this power, when I know of the manipulations of the gamblers on these exchanges and elsewhere who will take advantage of this power and always keep the farmers' market in an uncertain condition. The same thing is true as to cattle and as to wheat and the other great crops of this country.

But, to go back to my text, the only thing that I, the farmer, want is that I get no special privilege, and, in the name of God, give no special privilege to the other fellow. [Applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not consider that this measure grants any special privilege to agriculture. It rather appears to me that it is only confirming a natural right which agriculture ought to enjoy, whose exercise is not inimical to the legitimate interests of other people. No farmer can compete alone with the conditions that surround him. We all know that it is economically impossible for any individual farmer to compete with the conditions under which he must live. When he buys from a merchant he buys at the merchant's price, and he has no power to compel the merchant to reduce the price. When he buys agricultural machinery from implement houses he has no power as an individual to exercise a voice in determining the price he pays for it.

When he sells his product, it matters not whether it be corn, wheat, live stock, tobacco, or anything else, he must sell it at a price dictated not by himself but by others who have had no part in its production. For that reason I favor the passage of laws that will enable him and encourage him to cooperate with others similarly situated in order that greater efficiency may be secured and in order that the farmer may produce that which must feed and clothe us under conditions that will encourage the greatest production and conservation. The world needs more production. It is essential. If production is to increase, the conditions of marketing the produce of the farms must be improved and simplified. This measure, we hope, will assist in accomplishing this result.

There are some things in this substitute for the Capper-Hersman bill, which is now presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], with which I do not entirely agree. But the bill is presented under a procedure that makes its amendment impossible, and I shall vote for its passage, in the hope that as finally enacted into law it may be instrumental in greatly improving the marketing conditions under which those engaged in agricultural pursuits are now laboring.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, if I construed this bill in the same manner as many Members do, especially as those who oppose it construe it, I should not be inclined to favor it. I do not believe that the provisions of this bill confer upon the farmers any privileges which they did not have before. Certainly it does not confer upon any corporation organized by farmers any power which a corporation does not now have and which corporations are every day exercising. The bill gives them the right to organize for the purpose of marketing their products and authority to do any act which is necessary for that purpose. A careful examination of the bill convinces me that beyond that the bill gives them no privileges whatever.

The question may be asked, Why enact a bill under such circumstances? The reason is that the farmers are fearful to go into these associations because some of them have already been prosecuted under the antitrust laws, although those prosecutions have failed when it has been found they were merely entering into proper associations.

There is one provision in the bill that I do not like. The farmers are authorized to enter into these associations for the purpose of marketing their products, "any law to the contrary notwithstanding." This provision ought to have been stricken out of the bill. It is wholly unnecessary, and if it had any meaning I should not vote for the bill, as it would make the bill clearly unconstitutional. No law is constitutional that punishes one man and exempts another from punishment for the same act.

Mr. Chairman, for years I have made a careful study of the antitrust laws. Some 25 or 30 years ago I was a delegate to the convention to consider the regulations of trusts, which was held at Chicago. I have never believed in lowering or relinquishing any of the antitrust regulations. If this is done for one, it will eventually have to be done for all. If it is done for one class, it will encourage another class to come in and ask for the same exemption. In the end there will be nothing left of the antitrust laws. But no act provided for in this law is made illegal by the antitrust laws. Everything that an association can do under this law has been done for years by farmers' associations all over the country. In my own district we have had for years a highly successful and very beneficial association of the grape growers for the purpose of marketing their products. No one has ever dreamed of interfering with this association, and I would have had no hesitation in guaranteeing to the association that as long as they continue doing business in the manner in which they have heretofore carried it on that they violated no provision of the antitrust law. This association has been, and I have no doubt will still continue to be, simply an association for the purpose of marketing the products of its members. It has not been an association for the purpose of forcing up prices, and it has always offered its products for sale on the same terms to everyone. Consequently, its directors have gone ahead with a clear conscience, knowing that they were complying with the law.

Unfortunately, the Sherman antitrust law has been befogged by court decisions, and the farmer has, I think, been unnecessarily alarmed as to what proceedings might be taken against him under it. Instances were given of unjustifiable prosecution of farmers under the antitrust law, but I would not regard that as a reason for enacting this law. There are unjustifiable prosecutions under every criminal law. Some of them started in good faith, and some, of course, began through malice. The real

reason for the enactment of this law is, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], to encourage the formation of farmers' associations, in order to lessen the great cost of getting their products on the market, which is now altogether out of proportion to what it should be. I believe that when these associations are formed they will be beneficial alike to producer and consumer, and that if these associations are parties to any combination which is now unlawful, the provisions of this bill will not alter the situation in the least. If such a construction could possibly be put upon its terms—and I think it could not—then the courts would declare the bill itself unconstitutional.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is it on this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to revise the remarks I have just made on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I made some remarks on this bill last Friday, and I wish to revise and extend them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE].

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill. Under it I believe farmers will cooperate and will eventually eliminate the middleman, and by so doing they will bring their products to the consumer at a much cheaper rate than the consumer now pays and with a better profit to themselves.

This bill is, in substance, the Capper-Hersman bill. The object of this bill is to authorize farmers to form associations for the purpose of collectively marketing their products. We have a law similar to the proposed law in Wisconsin. The State laws can not confer any right upon their organizations to engage in interstate or foreign commerce. This bill will confer this right.

NEED OF LEGISLATION.

In the last few months more than 30 reputable farmers of the country have been indicted and placed on trial for collectively selling their milk for city distribution. So far, five trials of these men have taken place, and in each case the men have been acquitted. Farm organizations have been prosecuted in California, Minnesota, Illinois, and Ohio. In each case middlemen were responsible for the prosecution. In each case the farmers were acquitted by juries, but after expensive trials. It is a high compliment to the American sense of justice that the juries of laboring and business men sitting in these cases, after hearing volumes of evidence, and with the city press attempting to prejudice the case of the defendants, have quickly acquitted the defendants.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES.

This bill has the indorsement of practically all the farm organizations of America. It does not compel any existing farm organization or society to change its present organization. Associations will continue to be formed under State laws as before. The rights of the public are in every way safeguarded. The Secretary of Agriculture is given power to prevent any association organized under this law from exploiting the public, even if it was possible or the farm organization was so inclined. The farmer in the past has never been able to fix the price of the products he produced. The same corporations that fix the prices of farm products through the boards of trade, cold-storage warehouses, and other combinations of great corporations also fix the prices of everything the farmer buys. He is thus ground between two millstones. As a result, there is a great movement away from the farms.

DECREASE IN RURAL POPULATION.

Forty years ago in the United States 70 per cent of our population was a rural population. To-day only 35 per cent of our population live on the farms. The tax returns show that for every dollar of net income returns from the farms of the United States the manufacturers have returned \$72. It is natural for people to seek the most remunerative occupation. This accounts for more young men going into business than becoming farmers.

In a speech that I made in the House of Representatives on the sugar question May 25, 1920, on pages 7614 to 7617, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I gave a list of a great many cor-

porations that were making over 100 per cent yearly, and I cited a case of a coal company that paid profits in a single year equal to 78 times its capitalization. If a farmer made a net income of 100 per cent in a single year, it would mean that he could buy a farm, stock, purchase machinery as good as on the farm he made the profit from, and, if he was as successful as the coal company that made profits amounting to 78 per cent, he would buy 18 farms like the one he made the profit from.

PATRIOTISM OF THE FARMER.

The farmers of this country do not forget that 90 per cent of the Revolutionary soldiers were farmers, that 75 per cent of the soldiers from the North and South in the War of the Rebellion came from the farms and plantations, and that 50 per cent of our soldiers in the World War were from the country and cities of less than 3,000 inhabitants.

PRESENT ANTITRUST LAWS INEFFECTIVE AS TO GREAT CORPORATIONS BUT OPPRESSIVE TO THE SMALLER.

Our present Clayton antitrust law is ineffective as to large corporations. This law, which was intended to prevent price fixing by corporations, is violated daily by the large corporations. The law is used, however, to oppress farm organizations doing a legitimate and lawful business. For example: The United States Steel Corporation has what is known as the Gary dinner, which is annually held in Pittsburgh or New York. The heads of all the steel companies in the United States are invited to this dinner. Judge Gary, of the United States Steel Corporation, makes a felicitous speech, and in that speech suggests that the United States Steel Corporation thinks that \$50 or \$60 per ton for steel rails is a fair and reasonable price. There is no other agreement, but every steel company in the United States fixes the price of steel rails and other kinds of steel at the same price as the United States Steel Corporation.

GASOLINE.

We have a great many corporations selling different kinds of gasoline, and yet without any written agreement, but by simply whispering the word between the heads of the different corporations, gasoline companies simultaneously raise the price of gasoline. This price-fixing process goes on in regard to practically all the great articles produced by the large corporations of the country. There is no competition between these large concerns. The agreed price is fixed as effectively as though these concerns had signed a written agreement.

It would be impossible for the millions of farmers scattered throughout the United States to ever form a trust that would be oppressive. If it was possible for them to do so, the Secretary of Agriculture under this bill could dissolve the association.

COOPERATION IN DAIRYING.

By cooperation and the formation of cooperative creameries Wisconsin has built up the dairy industry second to none other in the United States, an industry which in that State alone produced over \$300,000,000 worth of dairy products the last year. If it was not for these cooperative creameries and cheese factories, the packers and Oleomargarine Trust would have destroyed the dairy interests. When the settlement was made by Attorney General Palmer with the packers the dairy industry was excepted, and the packers were allowed to control the cheese market and embark in the dairy business in competition with the farmer, but not with the groceryman and other industries. This illustrates one of the discriminations against the farmer.

OLEOMARGARINE.

The manufacturers of oleomargarine have a bill in Congress each year which would take off the 10 cents per pound tax on colored oleomargarine and place a tax of 1½ cents per pound thereon. This year the bill is known as H. R. 1032, introduced by Representative SABATH, of Chicago. The advocates of this bill maintain that the Government would increase its revenue by this tax and would also bring oleomargarine to the tables of people who can not afford butter, at a much lower price than it is now sold for. As a matter of fact, this bill if enacted into law would increase the price of oleomargarine by making it a competitor of butter, and it would sell almost as high as butter. Under the existing laws, with a 10-cent tax on colored oleomargarine, the man who wants to use oleomargarine can buy the uncolored oleomargarine for almost one-half the price he can buy butter. If he desires to color it for the use of his table he can do so. The uncolored oleomargarine bears a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

UNCOLORED OLEOMARGARINE.

Ninety-seven and one-half per cent of all oleomargarine sold is uncolored and only pays a tax of one-fourth cent per pound. Only 2½ per cent of the amount of oleomargarine manufactured

pays a tax of 10 cents per pound. If we should raise the tax to 15 cents on all oleomargarine, as provided by the Sabbath bill, it would immediately raise the price of oleomargarine 15 cents or 20 cents more per pound, because it would then all be colored and become a competitor of butter. Thus for every dollar that the consumer of oleomargarine would pay the Government in additional taxes, he would pay the large packing houses and oleomargarine factories from eight to ten dollars. When the cottonseed-oil people and the packers pose as philanthropists and ask the Government to tax them, the public should beware.

PURPOSE OF COLORING OLEOMARGARINE.

The purpose of coloring oleomargarine is to deceive the people. The same interests that are circulating an extensive propaganda attempting to popularize oleomargarine and telling of the impurities of butter, are fighting to prevent the passage of the bill allowing the farmers of the country to form cooperative societies. I have spoken against every oleomargarine bill that has been before Congress since I was in Congress, and I am going to continue to do so. Our dairy industry brings more wealth to my State than any other and demands a square deal.

FARMERS RESPOND TO CALL FOR PRODUCTION.

The farmers of the country, under the demand for greater production to supply our own people and our armies and the Allies, cultivated 32,000,000 acres more land in 1917 than in 1914. This production of food crops on an enlarged scale and at greatly increased expense of time, effort, and labor and by fewer men, did more to insure the winning of the war than any other one factor. During 1914 the United States exported 700,000,000 pounds of milk in the form of butter and cheese, and no condensed milk. During 1918 the United States shipped abroad 620,000,000 pounds of milk in the form of butter, and 160,000,000 pounds of milk in the form of cheese, and 1,770,000,000 pounds of milk in the form of condensed milk; 2,550,000,000 pounds of milk as dairy products used for foreign shipment.

In opposition to this bill I have had many petitions from the chambers of commerce of the larger cities. I have had many letters from individual farmers and farm organizations in favor of the bill. If the farmers are not given the opportunity to organize and do business collectively, they will be at the mercy of the middlemen and the large corporations that buy their products and then sell them to the consumer at an exorbitant price.

Our country is facing a serious crisis. People are flocking to the cities, and every census shows a very much larger per cent of people living in the cities than the country. The demand and need for food is constantly increasing. The labor situation on the farm also adds an additional problem. With the high price of building material, land, and machinery, it now takes a man of considerable capital to establish himself as a farmer. We should give the farmer encouragement in every way we can, to the end that our young men will find the occupation of farming profitable and offering as many advantages as business or the professions. The strength of our country depends upon its sturdy yeomanry.

EXTENSION OF RURAL ROUTES.

As an advocate for national aid for highways since I entered Congress, I have always insisted that along with the good-road movement the Federal Government should increase and extend its rural routes so as to bring mail and parcels conveniently near each farm. I have contended that there is no justification in delivering mail five or six times a day to the front doors of people living in the residential sections of the large cities, and compelling a busy farmer to walk one-half to 2 miles in order to get his mail once a day.

The parcel post has proven a great blessing to the rural population of the United States. It can not be utilized to advantage unless the rural carrier goes conveniently near to a man's house. I hope the day will not be far distant when every farmer will have a mail box in front of his home.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Army reorganization bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Army reorganization bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] has six minutes remaining.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. After consultation with a number of gentlemen on this floor, I have thought it well to offer an amendment to section 2.

The object of the amendment is to preserve to the farmers what rights they now have under the antitrust act. There is some question whether section 2 might not take away some of

the rights which they now have. There is no disposition on my part, and I do not think there was on the part of anyone, to deprive them of existing rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Does the gentleman offer the amendment for information?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Not for information; I offer the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the bill has not begun to be read. The gentleman can not offer the amendment at this time. General debate has not been concluded.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a House Calendar bill and there is nothing but general debate.

Mr. WALSH. This bill is being considered under a special rule, which provides that in the consideration there shall be two hours of general debate. Now, under that special rule I submit that it is not proper to offer an amendment during the two hours of general debate.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There is nothing but general debate on a House Calendar bill. It is not read for amendment under the five-minute rule. The rule uses the term "general debate," but that is all there would be anyhow unless the rule provided otherwise.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. After the general debate, will there not be an opportunity to offer amendments?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No opportunity to offer amendments unless the House votes down the previous question. Then the gentleman could offer amendments, but not discuss them.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the previous question is not ordered, it would be in order to offer amendments?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would be in order to offer amendments if the House did not order the previous question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DYER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Will this vote be on the previous question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No; it is a call of the House, a point of no quorum being made. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Echols	Kelly, Pa.	Reber
Anthony	Edmonds	Kendall	Rhodes
Bacharach	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Riddick
Baer	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan
Bell	Emerson	Kettner	Rowan
Bland, Mo.	Evans, Nev.	Kiess	Rowe
Booher	Ferris	Kitchin	Rucker
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	Klecza	Sanders, La.
Brinson	Gallivan	Kreider	Scully
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	Lankford	Sears
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Lazaro	Sells
Burke	Goodall	Lehlbach	Sherwood
Butler	Gould	Leshner	Shreve
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	Little	Slemp
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	McClintic	Small
Cantrill	Griest	McCulloch	Smith, Mich.
Caraway	Griffin	McDuffie	Smithwick
Carter	Hamill	McKinley	Snyder
Casey	Hardy, Colo.	McLane	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Tex.	MacCrate	Stevens, Ohio
Cole	Harrell	Mansfield	Stiness
Cooper	Hastings	Mason	Strong, Pa.
Copley	Hayden	Mays	Sullivan
Costello	Hays	Mead	Tague
Crowther	Hernandez	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Curry, Calif.	Hill	Morin	Tillman
Dale	Houghton	Mott	Watson
Davey	Hullings	Newton, Minn.	Wingo
Dent	Hutchinson	Newton, Mo.	Wright
Dewalt	Ireland	Nicholls	Williams
Dooling	James	Paige	Yates
Doremus	Johnson, Miss.	Porter	Young, N. Dak.
Drane	Johnson, S. Dak.	Radcliffe	Zihlman
Dunn	Johnston, N. Y.	Ramsayer	
Eagan	Juul	Randall, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and eighty-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record upon this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The Clerk proceeded to report the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Under the rule that was adopted, is it in order for the gentleman from Minnesota now to offer his amendment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. SABATH. Are other Members permitted to offer amendments?

The SPEAKER. If they obtain the floor.

Mr. SABATH. Can the Speaker inform me how Members can secure the floor to offer amendments?

The SPEAKER. By asking for recognition, unless the gentleman from Minnesota moves the previous question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the reporting of my amendment.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, the previous question was moved by the gentleman from Minnesota after he had offered his amendment. I then made the point of order that there was no quorum present. The reason I made the point of order that there was no quorum present was because the previous question had been moved by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the gentleman had moved the previous question, but the question had not been stated by the Chair.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the amendment reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Volstead amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. VOLSTEAD: At the end of section 2, add the following: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall apply to the organizations or individual members thereof described in section 6 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, known as the Clayton Act.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the bill to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri will state his point of order.

Mr. IGOE. The amendment is not germane to the section.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment is clearly germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, the point is that the amendment is not germane. This section has relation to the bill which provides for certain associations that are organized under section 1. Under section 2 certain acts of those associations may be investigated. There is nothing here about associations organized under the Clayton Act or any of these other acts. These associations are to be organized under this bill, and the gentleman undertakes to put some limitations upon associations in the bill. Therefore the amendment is not germane to anything in the bill. We are concerned with one particular kind of association provided for in this bill under the terms of the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill relates to certain associations provided for in section 1 of the bill. Section 2 of the bill thereupon provides as to those associations that certain authority shall be granted to the Secretary of Agriculture and to Congress. The amendment is that certain of those associations can not be operated upon by the Secretary of Agriculture, because they are now excluded from the operation of the law by the Clayton antitrust law. That is an exception within an exception, wholly permissible and entirely germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks clearly that this simply limits the operation of the section and must be germane. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I am desirous of moving to strike out section 2. At this stage of the procedure, would that motion be in order?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order if the gentleman had the floor.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The SPEAKER. Of course, if the House does not adopt the previous question; it will be in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. If the previous question is voted down then it would be in order for me to make the motion to strike out section 2?

The SPEAKER. Certainly. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. IGOE) there were—ayes 147, noes 62.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-three Members present, a quorum.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The vote is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota adopted?

The SPEAKER. Not yet. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the previous question.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, let us have the amendment reported.

The SPEAKER. By unanimous consent the amendment will be again reported.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Is the gentleman from Illinois asking for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the amendment or on the previous question?

Mr. SABATH. On the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that would be too late.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was on his feet demanding the yeas and nays on the previous question. There was a great deal of confusion in the Hall, and I have no doubt that the Speaker did not hear him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair supposed that he had demanded the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; he demanded the yeas and nays on ordering the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays on ordering the previous question. As many as are in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. There is no other side. The Chair just a moment ago counted 233 Members present, and 33 are not one-fifth of that number.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendment again read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

Mr. MONAHAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The bill has not been read the third time.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I desire to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a reading of the engrossed bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the request comes too late. The bill has been read.

The SPEAKER. The bill has not been read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the bill had been read.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. Pass the bill with the amendment?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill with the amendment.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a second.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the request comes too late, because the bill has been already passed upon and amended.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman has the right to demand a second. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] will take their places as tellers.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 140, noes 34.

So a second was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, when I had the floor before I started to ask some questions about this bill, but I did not have sufficient time. The first section of the bill is one of the most curiously constructed pieces of legislation that has ever been presented to this House. It undertakes to give something, and then in the second section it takes it away. In addition to taking away what is given by the first section it takes away practically the exemptions that were given to farmers by the Clayton Act. Now, I would like to ask somebody who had anything to do with preparing this bill what becomes of an association organized under the first section where a stockholder dies and the stock comes into the hands of some one who is not a producer? I would also like to ask what becomes of an association if some one who holds a share of stock should sell it to a nonproducer? There is absolutely no provision made for safeguarding the association. If these gentlemen mean what they said when explaining this bill, then the moment a single share of stock gets into the hands of a nonproducer, whether it is by operation of law or by sale, the association becomes an illegal association and may be prosecuted under the antitrust act.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman is asking a question as to persons who are concerned in the framing of this bill. Was not the gentleman concerned in the framing of the bill?

Mr. IGOE. No; and I would like to answer that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seems a rather remarkable thing to some of us here that this bill should come in here with a unanimous report and should now receive such vigorous opposition from members of the committee.

Mr. IGOE. The gentleman is mistaken in saying that it comes in with a unanimous report, because there were objections to the bill, and some of us voted against it in the committee. If the gentleman served on the Committee on the Judiciary, he would be familiar with the fact that all bills reported by that committee are not framed by the committee.

Mr. HERSMAN. Will the gentleman yield to me to answer the question?

Mr. IGOE. When I answer the gentleman from Ohio I will yield to the gentleman from California. This bill as originally drawn was known as the Capper-Hersman bill, prepared or introduced, rather, by Senator CAPPER in the Senate, and in the House by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN], and a duplicate by Mr. BARBOUR. Both gentlemen from California are very much interested in the welfare of associations that are organized out in California, where they have carried this cooperative business, perhaps, to the highest point of efficiency, and also in some instances to the nearest point of monopoly. When those bills came in we had hearings on them, copies of which I hold in my hand. The next that we heard of the bill was when the gentleman from Minnesota introduced a bill, not the Capper-Hersman bill, but the Volstead bill. Three days later another bill was introduced by Mr. VOLSTEAD. That bill came into the committee, and while we can not say what happened there I can say it was but a few minutes after the bill was presented to the whole committee when it was voted out without any amendment, without any discussion, without reading for amendments, and reported to this House for consideration.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. IGOE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEE. Will section 2, vesting power in the Secretary of Agriculture, be of full force and effect if the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is adopted that takes it under the operation of the law—

Mr. IGOE. I have not examined the amendment closely enough, but in my judgment it is a strange proceeding when you distinguish between an association organized under the

Clayton Act and an association organized under this act, but here is what will happen: Just the moment a clamor goes up in the country about the cost of any product of the farm, whenever you have a clamor such as we have had in the last 12 months, there is not a Secretary of Agriculture but who will be compelled to make an investigation, and then he will have to go into the business of every cooperative association in the United States, and after he has summoned the officers here and after he has examined all the books, after he has found out the nature of their operations, then he will be able to determine whether they are organized with or without capital stock. How, then, does the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota relieve an association which is legal under existing law from being harassed under section 2?

Mr. HERSMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. HERSMAN. I would like to ask the gentleman, first, if he is concerned for the interest of the farmer in stating that the Secretary of Agriculture will investigate these—

Mr. IGOE. Oh, I am deeply concerned about increasing production, and I am concerned about giving to the farmer a right to legitimately form cooperative associations, but I am not willing to give the farmer, the labor union, or the manufacturer a right, as you give under this bill, to violate all the laws of the United States that are binding upon other individuals and other corporations.

Mr. HERSMAN. The first question the gentleman asked was, What becomes of an association of which one member dies?

Mr. IGOE. What does become of it?

Mr. HERSMAN. I will tell you about it. In California—

Mr. IGOE. Oh, I am asking what becomes of it under this bill?

Mr. HERSMAN. I am going to tell you what becomes of it in California and under this bill.

Under the laws of California you can make an agreement to buy that stock. All the cooperative associations can preserve their entity as cooperative associations purely and have an option to buy all that stock before a man can sell it.

Mr. IGOE. What becomes of the farmer then?

Mr. HERSMAN. They have a right to buy that back.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Assuming that this bill was a law, and take a concrete case as to a crop with which I am familiar; suppose there is an organization of cotton farmers who produce cotton, and they are putting that cotton on the market in the fall season; now, there is another element of people who want cheap cotton through the exchanges or otherwise; what would be the effect on the local market, and what would be the effect of the price of the farmer's cotton if these people interested in beating down the price should file a sworn case before the Secretary?

Mr. IGOE. It would ruin the market.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Would there be any market?

Mr. IGOE. Of course there would not be.

Here is a curious thing. Some of the gentlemen who want this are milk producers—dairymen—who are associated together—and they are complaining now because they say that under the Clayton Act the district attorneys ask them about their business and how they do it, and they want something written into the law to make it certain that they can not be asked about their business. And so the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] by section 1 assumes he meets it. But in section 2 he gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to go and pry into their business every time he feels like it. I am objecting to the provision in this bill, gentlemen, most of all, in section 1, lines 8 to 11. That is the part I want to get this House to vote on, because there is not any question in the world but that it allows them not only to organize but after they are organized to go and violate all the laws against trusts, monopolies, and unfair trade.

Here are some questions that we had before the committee. I asked the attorney from California, Mr. Sapiro, who is a bright, clever gentleman, the following questions:

I am simply asking you if the broad exemption in Mr. HERSMAN'S bill was thought necessary by you.

Mr. SAPIRO. The only exemption should be as to contracts between the grower and the association.

Mr. IGOE. According to the language, Mr. HERSMAN is going to allow them to roam around through the United States and do anything they want in restraint of trade. That is the language of his bill.

Mr. SAPIRO. That is probably just loose language there. I am certain he had in mind the preliminary contract between the association, as such, and its growers.

Mr. IGOE. I was trying to get from you what you thought was absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of this association that you referred to.

Mr. SAPIRO. The way we have covered it is to say any such organizations or the members thereof, or the contracts made between such organizations and its members or stockholders shall not be held to be illegal.

That, however, is not what this bill says. This bill allows them to organize with capital stock, and then to go out as a corporation and do anything they want without regard to any law.

Now, let me tell you what was done out in California. The brief I have here was filed with the Federal Trade Commission and refers to the fact that one of the raisin companies went out into the trade and indulged in every sort of practice that would do credit, or discredit, to the Standard Oil Co. or any other trust. Among other things, they made a contract with a distributing company by which the distributors took the product of the raisin company at a certain price and agreed not to handle the product of any rival growers. In the course of time they could put anybody out of business.

Mr. BARBOUR. Was not that a case of fighting the devil with fire?

Mr. IGOE. I do not say they did not have a hard time. But let me tell you something. This bill affects all the people of the United States, and the people who are fighting each other with fire in California may be the same kind of people who are found throughout the United States jointly imposing upon the unprotected consumer. The consumer is not the millionaire, but he is the farmer also, and in many cases it is the farmer who will suffer by this bill. They can go to the farmer, as they did in California, and say, "You come in and join us or you can not do any business." And if this cooperative association goes to do business with the ultimate salesman or middleman, it can say to him, "You handle our stuff, but nobody else's," and they can put the independent farmer out of business.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not desire to criticize these gentlemen, but does not the gentleman think it bad practice for a great committee such as the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, of which he is the ranking minority member, to report a bill of this importance to the House without any suggestion that amendments would be offered? I learned from members of the Rules Committee that no suggestion was made that the bill was not unanimously reported.

Mr. IGOE. I will say that the committee never asked for any rule officially. The chairman did it himself.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The House, it seems to me, should be informed, where a bill of this importance comes in with a unanimous report, that the bill has not unanimous support.

Mr. IGOE. There is no unanimous report. We offer a good many suggestions usually, but this bill went through the committee in a great hurry. I never knew until after they went before the Rules Committee that a rule was to be asked for. I voted against the proposition to suspend the rules the other day, and you have a motion here to suspend the rules, and I am against it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to special legislation or legislation in behalf of any special class and I would oppose this measure if I believed it would operate to exempt farmers from the provisions of a just law, properly intended to include them. Organizations such as is contemplated by this measure have been considered by some as contrary to the letter of the antitrust law, but I believe that no one who knows anything about organizations of this kind or such as would be possible under this bill would consider them contrary to the spirit of that law. Those who oppose this bill say it will put farmers in a special, exempted class. I do not consider this will operate as an exemption from the antitrust law. I do not consider it as an exception at all. I consider it as a definition of what are not objectionable organizations; a definition of entirely safe and proper organizations which are not intended to be included and which are not in fact included in antitrust laws.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN] a few minutes ago said, as I understood him, that if this bill shall become law it will conflict with antitrust laws of the States and thereby cause confusion. In many of the States there are antitrust laws and overzealous officials in some of the States have caused the arrest of officers of farm organizations and prosecutions have followed. But in each instance, as far as my knowledge extends, the court after full trial determined that farm organizations, the same as contemplated here, are not contrary to the antitrust law of the State in which the trial was had. A trial was had in the gentleman's own State, New York. Milk producers were arrested, or rather, officers of milk producers' associations were arrested. What for? Not for combining in restraint of trade, not because they undertook to monopolize the trade, not because they tried to fix unreasonable prices,

but because the farmers, acting through the officers of their associations, were carrying on business with dealers in one of the great cities of that State.

It developed on the trial that the farmers, through their dairy organizations, were asking and receiving 7 or 7½ cents a quart for their milk, while the dealers in the city were distributing and selling it to consumers at from 15 to 18 cents a quart. Consumers of the milk believed the farmers were responsible for and were receiving these improperly high prices, whereas the farmers, by negotiation through their officers with the city milk dealers, had simply obtained the best price the dealers would pay; that is, the market price. They did nothing by way of fixing the price; they sold for the available price.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Pardon me; I can not yield in my time.

The same situation developed when farmers and dairymen in the vicinity of the city of Cleveland were arrested. Officers of the association were arrested, taken from their beds at the dead of night, and thrown into jail. On the trial the dairy officials were acquitted. There was the same kind of trial with the same result in Chicago following the arrest of officers of a dairy association composed of Illinois farmers.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The chairman of the committee gives me one additional minute, in which time I wish to say that in the cities where farmers have been arrested, charged with violation of antitrust laws of the States, in each one it was determined after trial that they were not acting in violation of law. And in one or two of the States in which such organizations of farmers seemed to be a violation of law the governors promptly called special sessions of the legislatures, and the legislatures amended the law so as to permit the organization of such associations. And in other States, at the next regular session, amendments of the laws of those States along the line of this bill were passed by the legislatures. [Applause.] The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] charges that the Committee on the Judiciary has improperly failed and refused to report out the original Capper-Hersman bill, which was so generally approved by farmers and farm organizations. The fact is, and the gentleman must know it, that after long hearings and full consideration the bill we are now considering was substituted for the Capper-Hersman bill, and substitution was with the entire approval of the authors of the original bill and with approval of farm organizations which appeared before the committee. Mr. HERSMAN has himself spoken here in support of this bill, and a few days ago, when I was before the Committee on Rules of the House urging a rule by which this bill might be considered and passed at this session, Mr. Loomis, secretary of an association representative of farmers and farm organizations, including the National Grange, was before the Rules Committee and expressed approval of this bill on behalf of the organizations he represents. So this bill is acceptable to farmers; they believe it will enable them to market their products better than they can now; and that by better marketing they will be able to get a larger part of the prices paid by consumers. They wish to operate properly and always within the law.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] made an inquiry about this bill, and referred to the fact of there being a unanimous report upon it. I consulted Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and found under the word "prudential" this quotation:

My lord admiral had a prudential eye to the main chance.

This explains the sudden disappearance of the Capper-Hersman bill and the Barbour bill and all other bills on which hearings were had before the Committee on the Judiciary. The only bills on which hearings were had were bills that were heard in October, 1919. No hearings were had on this bill, which now comes out "for prudential reasons" under the name of the Volstead Act. That answers the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Now, I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that we find ourselves face to face, by the extraordinary process of the suspension of the rules, with the consideration of a bill which should be amended, and yet which under this rule we have no power to amend. We set aside the bill introduced by the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. BARBOUR] and the bill introduced by another gentleman from California [Mr. HERSMAN], and the bill of Senator CAPPER, on which hearings were had; and I pause long enough to say that I hold in my hand a motion to recommit, which I intended to offer under the parliamentary practice, which I would have offered under the ordinary rules of procedure, submitting to the House the so-called Capper-Hersman bill; a motion to recommit embodying the entire Capper-Hersman bill, which was also, I believe, the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR]. And yet under the extraordinary rule—the rule which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] so well said on Saturday was a rule that the Republican majority would find themselves facing, we are now up against just what he said would occur, and that is the consideration of measures without the power of proper amendment.

Here is a bill which should be amended. It has good features, and many Members want to vote for it. But it should be amended. Yet it is an unconsidered bill, a bill upon which no hearings were had, a bill upon which no opportunity was given for a minority report, a bill upon which the committee as a committee never asked for a rule from the Committee on Rules. None of these parliamentary processes were ever indulged in with respect to it. None has ever been asked. And yet under the extraordinary process of the suspension of all rules we now come in, we throw aside the hearings, we throw aside the considered merits of the Capper-Hersman bill and of the Barbour bill, and we present to this House an unconsidered bill, an ill-considered bill, without the slightest opportunity for amendment.

I have asked the gentleman in charge of the bill—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. GOODYKOONTZ].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Mr. Speaker, public morals, crystallized into the common law, condemned as illegal every combination and conspiracy in restraint of trade. This doctrine was recognized and reinforced by the Congress when it passed the Sherman law and the Elkins Antitrust Act. More recently there has crept into our laws an exception as to those who market foodstuff, whereby the latter are exempted from the operation of the statute, but they are subject to the provisions of the Lever Act, which gives the President power to regulate the price and distribution not only of food supplies but also of fuel and clothing. That power has not been exercised in the direction of reducing the cost of these necessities of life. The President intervened as to coal and fixed the price of that commodity below the average cost of production. The price of wheat was also fixed by law. But as regards cotton, sugar, and rice grown in the South, there was no regulation as to price. Thus favored by the administration and immune from prosecution, the southern planters shrewdly combined, and as a result the prices of cotton goods, sugar, and rice have been quadrupled. As a further result, a great cry—the combined voice of millions—has gone up, denouncing the profiteer and calling upon Congress to do something to reduce the cost of living.

Great numbers of our people are sorely pressed from the extortions that are being practiced upon them. In the presence of the nation-wide affliction of high prices, men have the audacity to ask me to support this measure. If the bill should become law the practices denounced as immoral at common law, and made criminal under previous laws of Congress, would be legalized, and the price-fixing of food and raiment validated. The country would see organized, under the terms of the act, gigantic food and clothing trusts, vested with power to charge whatever their sweet will dictated and to grind under their iron heel every family in the land. The giants thus unchained would be harnessed up, not by farmers—the honest yeomanry of the country—but be harnessed up and manipulated by the same men—the profiteers—who now have their felonious fingers in the pockets of the people.

No farmer or farmer's organization has asked me to support this bill. I would be glad to support any measure that would encourage or assist the farmer, for his hardships are many. This I know from experience, but I will not vote to make lawful that which, by its very nature, is unlawful.

The question is, How far are we going to permit demagoguery in this House to proceed? Shall we make abortive every effort of Congress, the country, and the administration to reduce the high cost of living? Shall we put into the hands of men the absolute, consummate power to charge for the necessities of life whatever they may want to charge?

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. I will yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I wish the gentleman would suggest to the House what effort the Department of Justice has made to cut down the high cost of living.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. Well, the department has made a little headway. Recently the department caused to be indicted a grocery jobbing company organized in my State for buying six carloads of sugar at 14 cents and selling the same at 30 cents per pound.

Mr. KEARNS. When did the company buy the sugar at the price of 14 cents per pound? The Department of Justice gave the sugar producers the right to charge 18 cents per pound.

Mr. GOODYKOONTZ. The sugar was bought by the jobber long ago, but delivered and resold at a date quite recent. The Attorney General by his own hand wrote the bill to amend the Lever Act and sent the same here and we passed it—my recollection is without any change in the language. If the law does not have teeth in it, or if the law is not being enforced, it is not the fault of Congress. The blame is chargeable to the administration, of which the Department of Justice is part, and not to us. Congress can make law, but it has no power to enforce it. [Applause.]

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word. It is suggested that the Capper-Hersman bill was thrown in the wastebasket. Senator CAPPER has introduced this very bill in the Senate, and Mr. HERSMAN has spoken to-day in favor of the bill. Every organization that was back of the Capper-Hersman bill is, so far as known, back of this bill. An appeal for the passage of the Capper-Hersman bill is an appeal for the defeat of all legislation.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I can not yield now. It seems to me that we ought to treat the farmers fairly instead of sneering at them, as some have done in this debate. They ought not to be prosecuted nor persecuted for doing the only thing that will give them a fair deal. We only ask that they may be given the rights that they are accorded in every other country. Congress ought to have the fairness to insist that they be given the means to protect themselves, so a few middlemen do not rob them of their profits. The commission merchants are the ones that are making the profits now and fighting this bill. Can you afford to ignore the demand of the farmers for this legislation and suffer so great and vital an industry to be exploited by these men? You are not going to do it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. What is the legislative status of the present bill if the motion to suspend the rules does not pass, it having been considered under a rule?

The SPEAKER. If the House refuses to suspend the rules and pass the bill it stands with the previous question ordered for a third reading.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 58, answered "present" 3, not voting 132, as follows:

YEAS—234.

Almon	Christopherson	Foster	Jones, Pa.
Anderson	Clark, Mo.	Frear	Jones, Tex.
Andrews, Nebr.	Classon	Freeman	Kahn
Anthony	Cleary	French	Kearns
Ashbrook	Copley	Fuller, Ill.	Keller
Ayres	Crago	Gandy	Kelley, Mich.
Bankhead	Cramton	Garland	Kincheloe
Barbour	Crisp	Glynn	King
Barkley	Currie, Mich.	Goodwin, Ark.	Kinkaid
Bee	Darrow	Green, Iowa	Knutson
Begg	Davis, Minn.	Greene, Vt.	Kraus
Bell	Davis, Tenn.	Hadley	Kreider
Benham	Dempsey	Hamilton	Lampert
Benson	Denison	Harrison	Lanham
Black	Dent	Haugen	Larsen
Blackmon	Dickinson, Mo.	Hawley	Layton
Bland, Ind.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hays	Lea, Calif.
Bland, Va.	Dominick	Heflin	Lee, Ga.
Blanton	Doughton	Hersey	Loneragan
Boles	Dowell	Hersman	Longworth
Box	Drewry	Hickey	Luhning
Brand	Dunbar	Hicks	McArthur
Briggs	Dyer	Hoch	McDuffie
Brooks, Ill.	Elliott	Hoe	McFadden
Brooks, Pa.	Esch	Holland	McKenzie
Browne	Evans, Mont.	Howard	McKeown
Burdick	Evans, Nebr.	Huddleston	McLaughlin, Mich.
Burroughs	Fairfield	Hudspeth	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Butler	Fess	Hull, Iowa	McPherson
Campbell, Kans.	Fields	Hull, Tenn.	MacGregor
Candler	Fisher	Jacoway	Magee
Cannon	Flood	Johnson, Ky.	Major
Carss	Focht	Johnson, S. Dak.	Mann, Ill.
Chindblom	Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Mann, S. C.

Mapes	Platt	Sims	Treadway
Michener	Porter	Sinclair	Upshaw
Miller	Purnell	Sinnott	Vestal
Milligan	Quin	Sisson	Vinson
Monahan, Wis.	Rainey, Ala.	Smith, Idaho	Voigt
Mondell	Rainey, H. T.	Smith, Ill.	Volstead
Montague	Raker	Snell	Ward
Moore, Va.	Ramsey	Stecgall	Wason
Morgan	Randall, Calif.	Stedman	Weaver
Mott	Randall, Wis.	Steenerson	Webster
Mudd	Rayburn	Stevenson	Welling
Murphy	Reavis	Stoll	Welty
Neely	Reed, N. Y.	Strong, Kans.	Whaley
Nelson, Mo.	Reed, W. Va.	Summers, Wash.	Wheeler
Nelson, Wis.	Ricketts	Summers, Tex.	White, Kans.
Newton, Mo.	Robison, Ky.	Sweet	White, Mo.
Nolan	Rodenberg	Swope	Williams
Oldfield	Romjue	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, Ill.
Oliver	Rose	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, Pa.
Osborne	Rouse	Temple	Wise
Overstreet	Rubey	Thomas	Wood, Ind.
Padgett	Sanders, Ind.	Thompson	Woods, Va.
Park	Sanders, N. Y.	Timberlake	Wright
Parker	Schall	Tincher	
Parrish	Scott	Towner	

NAYS—58.

Ackerman	Edmonds	Maher	Sabath
Aswell	Gallagher	Martin	Siegel
Babka	Ganly	Merritt	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan	Garner	Minahan, N. J.	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Garrett	Mooney	Tilson
Carew	Goodykoontz	Moore, Ind.	Tinkham
Coady	Humphreys	Newton, Minn.	Valle
Collier	Husted	O'Connell	Walsh
Connally	Igoe	Ogden	Walters
Cullen	Lazaro	Pell	Watkins
Dallinger	Luce	Peters	Wilson, La.
Donovan	Lufkin	Phelan	Winslow
Dunn	McAndrews	Robinson, N. C.	Young, Tex.
Eagle	McGlennon	Rogers	
Echols	McKiniry	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Gard	Johnson, Miss.	Pou
------	----------------	-----

NOT VOTING—132.

Andrews, Md.	Emerson	Kennedy, Iowa	Rhodes
Bacharach	Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, R. I.	Riddick
Baer	Ferris	Kettner	Riordan
Bland, Mo.	Fuller, Mass.	Kiess	Rowan
Boehrer	Gallivan	Kitchin	Rucker
Bowers	Godwin, N. C.	Klecza	Sanders, La.
Brinson	Goldfogle	Langley	Sanford
Britten	Good	Lankford	Scully
Brumbaugh	Goodall	Lehlbach	Sears
Burke	Gould	Leshner	Sells
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Byrns, Tenn.	Graham, Pa.	Little	Shreve
Campbell, Pa.	Greene, Mass.	McClintic	Slemp
Cantrill	Griest	McCulloch	Small
Caraway	Griffin	McKinley	Smith, Mich.
Carter	Hamill	McLane	Smithwick
Casey	Hardy, Colo.	MacCrate	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Hardy, Tex.	Madden	Steele
Cole	Harrell	Mansfield	Stephens, Ohio
Cooper	Hastings	Mason	Stiness
Costello	Hayden	Mays	Strong, Pa.
Crowther	Hernandez	Mead	Sullivan
Curry, Calif.	Hill	Meon	Tague
Dale	Houghton	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Davey	Hulings	Morin	Tillman
Dewalt	Hutchinson	Nicholls	Vare
Dooling	Ireland	O'Connor	Venable
Doremus	James	Olney	Watson
Drane	Jeffers	Paige	Wingo
Dupré	Johnston, N. Y.	Radcliffe	Woodyard
Eagan	Juul	Rainey, J. W.	Yates
Ellsworth	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Kendall	Reber	Zihlman

So, two-thirds voting in the affirmative, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McKINLEY and Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for) with Mr. SULLIVAN (against).

Mr. MOORE of Ohio and Mr. HARDY of Texas (for) with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (against).

Mr. POU and Mr. MOON (for) with Mr. WOODYARD (against).

Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. CARTER (for) with Mr. DOOLING (against).

Mr. DAVEY and Mr. CANTRELL (for) with Mr. VARE (against).

Mr. McCLINTIC and Mr. FERRIS (for) with Mr. RIORDAN (against).

Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. BACHARACH (for) with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York (against).

Mr. LANKFORD and Mr. COOPER (for) with Mr. ROWAN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. RHODES with Mr. TILLMAN.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. COLE with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. HERNANDEZ with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. ELSTON with Mr. DRANE.

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. MACCRATE with Mr. SEARS.
Mr. KENDALL with Mr. CASEY.
Mr. HILL with Mr. DUPRE.
Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. MAYS.
Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. WINGO.
Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. TAGUE.
Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. MORIN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. YATES with Mr. SMITHWICK.
Mr. BAER with Mr. MANSFIELD.
Mr. WATSON with Mr. NICHOLLS.
Mr. STINESS with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. KITCHIN.
Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. BRINSON.
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. O'CONNOR.
Mr. REBER with Mr. DEWALT.

Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. GOULD with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. SLEMP with Mr. KETTNER.
Mr. GOOD with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. KIESS with Mr. OLNEY.
Mr. SHREVE with Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi.
Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. BOOHER.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. JOHN W. RAINY.
Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. LINTHICUM.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. McLANE.
Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. LESHNER.
Mr. HARDY of Colorado with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. DALE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. CARAWAY.
Mr. GRIEST with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
Mr. GOODALL with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MASON with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.
Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am paired on this bill, and I desire to answer "present."

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea," but was not advertent to the fact that I was paired with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. WOODYARD, so I desire to withdraw my vote and to answer "present."

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. CANTRELL, is absent, but he has authorized me to state that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 7158, the so-called half-and-half bill for the District of Columbia, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the half-and-half bill, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 7158) to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if this bill does not make permanent law the old half-and-half system of taxation?

Mr. MAPES. It does not.

Mr. BLANTON. Does it carry out the gentleman's idea of what taxation in the District of Columbia should be?

Mr. MAPES. The Senate amendment does not.

Mr. BLANTON. What does the Senate amendment do, if it does not restore the old half-and-half system?

Mr. MAPES. The Senate amendment repeals the existing law which limits the estimates of the commissioners to twice the estimated revenue raised by taxation in the District of Columbia and provides for a changeable tax rate, depending upon the budget.

Mr. BLANTON. If the Senate amendment should be adopted by the House conferees, then would the Government of the United States continue to pay half the expenses of running the District of Columbia, as has been done heretofore?

Mr. MAPES. If the House conferees and the House accepted the Senate amendment, it would.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any chance of the House conferees accepting the Senate amendment without giving the House a vote on it?

Mr. MAPES. I do not imagine there is.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman agree to give the House a chance to vote on the matter before he accepts the Senate amendment?

Mr. MAPES. Oh, I do not think there is any occasion for making such an agreement. The conferees know the attitude of the membership of the House on the question, and, personally, they are as much opposed to this half-and-half principle as anyone.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. PLATT. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a telegram announcing the death of Hon. Thomas W. Bradley, my predecessor in Congress. He was an honored Member of this House for 10 years, 1903 to 1913, and died at his home at Walden, in Orange County, N. Y., where he has been living since his retirement. Col. Bradley was a veteran of the Civil War and a medal of honor man, having received his medal of honor for gallantry on the field at Chancellorsville, where he volunteered, though only a boy of 17, to go forward toward the Confederate lines and to take from a fallen mule ammunition cases which had been strapped to the mule and bring them back under fire. According to the medal of honor book, during part of the time that he was coming back, carrying the ammunition cases, he turned around and faced the foe, walking backward. The Confederate soldiers, always admiring bravery, ceased firing at him and cheered. [Applause.] It seems particularly fitting that such a soldier should have died on Decoration Day.

Col. Bradley was born in England in 1844. He came to this country at the age of 2 years. He enlisted in the One hundred and twenty-fourth New York Infantry as a mere boy and returned a captain before he was 21 years of age. He was wounded in battle three times, at Gettysburg, at the Wilderness, and at Boylton Plank Road. He became after the Civil War a successful manufacturer of knives, and, entering politics, served several terms in the New York State Assembly before his election to Congress. In the House of Representatives he served on the Committee on Invalid Pensions and on the Committee on Military Affairs. Many Members of this House remember him, and many have spoken to me about him in terms of warm friendship and affection. He was a man of peculiarly lovable disposition, the idol of the people of his home town and county, and at the same time a man of strong convictions and sturdy character. I want to make acknowledgment here before men who know him that I personally owe much to his friendship and kindly advice.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 29 they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 11960. An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and

H. R. 13416. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 2. An act to pension soldiers of the War with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, and the China relief expedition.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2279. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest;

S. 4435. An act to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America; and

S. 4259. An act to provide further for the relief of war minerals producers and to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war and for other purposes," approved February 2, 1919.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4435. An act to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from Governments of the Republics of South America; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 4259. An act to provide further for the relief of war minerals producers and to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved February 2, 1919; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

S. 2279. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Humboldt National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FREEMAN, until further notice, on account of illness in his family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill which has just been passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5006) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, are we now proceeding with the call of the Calendar for Unanimous Consent by virtue of the suspension rule that we passed?

The SPEAKER. We are.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON], in charge of the bill, is away with the Indian Committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been on the top of the calendar for a long time. Are we to continue it there, or is it going to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. SINNOTT. I would like to have it continued until the gentleman returns, as he has been negotiating with the Forestry Department and the Park Service concerning the matter.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman return before the 5th?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he will not.

Mr. SINNOTT. I have no information about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar the chances are

that nobody will object to it, but if he is going to keep it at the head of the calendar there may be objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman insists, then I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice, to go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BUILDINGS AT CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3706) authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this seems to be a rather important measure. I have forgotten just how much it involves. Can the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] give us that information?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be a great amount involved in this bill. The bill as it passed the Senate authorizes the Secretary of War to adjust the damages these lessees have suffered. They are men who erected buildings on the zone at Camp Funston for mercantile pursuits and amusement enterprises for the soldiers at the camps. They were given a five-year lease. They erected these buildings at their own expense. After a lapse of about three years they were ordered off the reservation. The Government is now occupying the buildings, and the lessees are asking that they be recompensed for the amount they have lost, for the balance of their lease—that is, the amount they have lost in the construction of the buildings.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTHONY. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Under this bill will these people be permitted to claim a recovery for prospective profits?

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not think so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Is there any doubt about it?

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, the War Department—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I object.

Mr. ANTHONY. Oh, I wish the gentleman would wait a moment and let me answer the question. The War Department has consistently ruled in adjusting all of the large contracts growing out of the war that they will not allow anything for prospective profits, and we assume that they will not change their policy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman explain why he answered my question by saying that he did not know whether they would or not?

Mr. ANTHONY. It is impossible to tell what the Secretary of War will do. It is to be assumed that he will do the sensible thing. He has not paid prospective profits to anyone, and I assume that he will adhere to that policy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would the gentleman assent to an amendment that these profits shall not be permitted?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I do not think that this is necessarily guiding, but the following statement is made in a letter of the Secretary of War relating to this bill:

If these expenditures were made at the instance of the commanding general of the camp and were in the interest of the soldiers at the camp, it would seem equitable to authorize the Secretary of War to pay such sums, not in excess of actual losses, as is necessary to reimburse the holders of these licenses or leases.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Actual losses. Does it mean losses in construction or losses of profit which they anticipated?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, losses of profits would be prospective losses. Actual losses, I take it, under any construction would only relate to money actually invested and lost.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would not the gentleman from Illinois think it is safer, in view of the hands into which this is to go for construction, to have it written into the law that profits should not be allowed?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I object.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not say it would not be, but under the letter of the Secretary of War—

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT TO HOMESTEAD LAW, ALASKA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10806) to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved shore spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is in charge of this bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] is not here, but probably I can answer the question.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question: This is a reservation which was made on the shores of the Alaska coast, which was in a way the culmination of many contests and years of efforts in this House and in the Government to preserve the right of navigation, and so forth, on the shores of Alaska and to prevent monopoly there. There was a long fight over it. I believe one Secretary of the Interior went out as the result, probably, of that fight. A good many reputations were possibly made or damaged; and when the bill passed the House gave certain rights, and this reservation was made to protect the water. Now, I do not pretend to be familiar with the present situation, but I wondered whether the Committee on the Public Lands, I think possibly all the members of which have come into the House since the original legislation, were familiar with the contests and the reasons for this.

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the theory of this bill is that no one gets an entry of this kind as a matter of right. The Secretary of Agriculture will not eliminate any land from the forest for entry under the first part of the bill if it is needed for shore or dock rights. Then, under the second part of the bill the Secretary of the Interior in a proper case will permit the entry, but the applicant does not procure the entry as a matter of right.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The original law—the gentleman has not answered the question, possibly may not have the information—was designed to protect the public by reserving certain spaces between places which were made by private individuals or by corporations or by individuals for the benefit of corporations, so no one could get a monopoly on some of these ports; at some places where navigation could be had, so no one would have the right to gain a monopoly of the shore line where vessels could come in. Now, I say I am not familiar with the present situation, but certainly the answer of the gentleman is hardly sufficient, because there was a reason for the enactment of the law. Now, if Congress made a mistake about it, and it may have made a mistake at the time, somebody ought to tell us so and why. I do not know, but it was the deliberate judgment at the time. This was not hastily enacted; it was not carelessly enacted; it was not enacted without knowledge of what they were doing.

Mr. SINNOTT. I have no knowledge of the old law except what the gentleman from Illinois has given to me. We were informed by both departments that they could protect the situation. Here is the gentleman from Alaska now, and he perhaps can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GRIGSBY. What is the question?

Mr. SINNOTT. The question was in reference to the original law, which the gentleman from Illinois says was designed to protect the shore rights, and he asked whether or not the matter is thrown open and unguarded by this bill?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Well, this bill is to extend the homestead laws of Alaska with reference to spaces of 80 rods along the shore line of all Alaska waters. That provision was inserted in the original act because it was thought that homesteaders might take up all the water suitable for harborage purposes. Now, there are on account of that reservation about 50,000 miles of good agricultural land which is unnecessarily reserved from entry.

This bill simply places it in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to waive that reservation wherever he sees fit. It does not absolutely throw the land open, but if the Secretary of the Interior deems that any particular entry will take up land that is wanted for harborage purposes he can refuse the patent. Otherwise he will grant it.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a short question? It reserves to the Secretary the right to protect the harbors?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Absolutely.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does this proposition include any mineral rights?

Mr. GRIGSBY. It does not affect any mineral rights in any way. All the land is open for mineral entry except in the forest reserves, anyway.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This 80-rod reserve does not affect their mineral rights at all?

Mr. GRIGSBY. It affects them in no way.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Your bill does not affect minerals?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Not at all. It is to give the Secretary of the Interior the right to waive the 80-rod provision as to shore spaces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. L., p. 409), extending the homestead laws to Alaska, and the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. L., p. 1028), amendatory thereof, creating 80-rod reserve spaces between entries and claims along the shores of navigable or other waters in the Territory of Alaska, are hereby repealed, and the shore spaces created by said acts are hereby restored to the public domain, but nothing herein shall prevent the President from withdrawing such shore lands as may be deemed necessary or advisable in the public interests.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the provisions of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. L., p. 409), extending the homestead laws to Alaska, and of the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. L., p. 1028), amendatory thereof, in so far as they reserve from sale and entry a space of at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions thereof along the shore of any navigable water, and provide that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water, shall not apply to lands classified and listed by the Secretary of Agriculture for entry under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stat., p. 233), and that the Secretary of the Interior may upon application to enter or otherwise in his discretion restore to entry and disposition such reserved spaces and may waive the restriction that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water as to such lands as he shall determine are not necessary for harborage uses and purposes."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REVENUES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to take from the Speaker's table the half-and-half bill, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for the conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, which the Clerk will report, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7158) to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection I made awhile ago.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAPES, Mr. FOCHT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FLOOD-CONTROL WORKS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13313) to authorize the construction of flood-control and improvement works in Boise de Sioux River, the Red River of the North, and Lake Traverse, between the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know from the gentleman in charge of the bill something of the facts. As it is drawn it is in a very peculiar form. It provides that—

The drainage districts and other municipal authorities of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, or anyone or more of them now or hereafter organized, etc., are hereby authorized to construct a dam.

Suppose there are a dozen such districts and authorities now organized; suppose four of them come to-day to the War Department and ask to do this work, and next week another combination of them come; suppose their plans are conflicting. Is it not a little indefinite to say that these districts or any of them may do a certain thing?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The situation is this: Some of those districts have not been formed, and it is difficult to determine definitely just how they will be formed. I can not see any great difficulty, because the Board of Engineers are the final judges as to what they approve, and these districts would have to comply with the requirements of the War Department in that respect. The engineers can only approve one plan.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman thinks it is all right, very well. Of course, if one or two of them, even under that option, rush in with a set of plans that the Secretary knows nothing about, and he approves them, and the other bunch is slower and get here late—

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They would have to take their chances.

Mr. CRAMTON. I understand the gentleman is familiar with the conditions, and if he thinks it will meet the case, I will not make any objection.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I do not think there can be any difficulty at all. Those things can not be done in the dark. The organizations covering the territory affected are the only ones that could act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I desire to make inquiry as to whether this bill is intended to correct a condition or is it merely operating on what may be a theory as to some flood-protection business?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There have been a great many plans made for the purpose of seeing if they could not find some way in which to relieve that country from the flood conditions that occur almost every spring.

No money is asked from the Federal Treasury. We are asking simply for power to go on and do the work. It happens to be an interstate stream, and in consequence we must have authority from the Federal Government to enable us to act.

Mr. GARD. The thing that impresses me is that there is no plan of flood protection. I would be glad to give my support to any plan of Federal acquiescence. I am happy to say that some of the States are willing to take care of their own business and not burden the Federal Government, and to that extent I appreciate what the gentleman is trying to do. But I note in the report that under a provision passed in the last river and harbor act the States were authorized to enter into an agreement to do the work, and the report states that the War Department has refused to give its approval on the ground that the legislation did not authorize the States to act through their drainage districts. What I wanted to ask was whether the river and harbor bill, which has again been sent to conference after some discussion, would carry a general provision which would allow these gentlemen to proceed?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No provision is contained in that bill at all. This provision is intended to remedy the defect in the old authorization. Now the trouble with the old authorization was that the States of Minnesota and North and South Dakota might do the work. The State of Minnesota under its constitution has no power to spend money for internal improvements of this kind. Consequently it was held by the Board of Engineers that the authorization to the State contained in the river and harbor appropriation act was not sufficiently broad so as to permit action through the drainage districts.

Mr. GARD. Is there any agreed-upon plan of flood protection up here at the outlet of Lake Traverse, in the Boise de Sioux River?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There has been a plan surveyed, and no doubt it will be put into effect as intended if this legislation goes through.

Mr. GARD. What is the use of getting legislation unless you know what is going through?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They adopted a plan that we tried to put into effect under the old provision.

Mr. GARD. The trouble about it, as I see it, is that you have no agreed-upon plan.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Oh, there has been a plan agreed upon.

Mr. GARD. You said there was not, a moment ago. You said you had tried to get it.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There have been a number of surveys. A plan was adopted and submitted by the governors of the three States to the Secretary of War for the purpose of having the work done, but when that was submitted objection was made by the Secretary on the ground that I have suggested, and hence we come now with this bill for the purpose of obtaining permission to do the work through drainage districts.

Mr. GARD. What I wanted to be advised of was whether these were drainage districts or municipal districts having adequate authority. I think it is a very vague phrase. It should be drainage districts.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. In Minnesota the drainage districts will be formed. In South Dakota I am not sure that they have drainage districts, but they will operate through the counties. But they all have agreed, and this allows them to agree, to do the work. They have State legislation authorizing them to act under legislation of this kind. This bill has been presented to the War Department, and it has the approval of that department.

Mr. GARD. It may be said to have the War Department's approval, but the approval is not very pertinent to the issue. What I want particularly to know about is whether these drainage districts have agreed upon the plan to build a dam at the outlet of Lake Traverse in the Boise de Sioux River.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is the plan that has been agreed to.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Is not this the situation, that the States have made a plan and submitted it to the War Department for approval?

Mr. GARD. That is what I am trying to learn, whether there has been a definite plan agreed upon by the States and submitted to the Secretary of War.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There has been a definite plan agreed upon by the States and submitted to the Secretary of War, and the States were prepared to enter upon the work, but the War Department then said that authority was only given to the States directly to do the work, whereas the States had prepared to have the work done through drainage districts. This is simply to permit the States to do the work through drainage districts, the plan having been agreed upon, and the States being prepared to go ahead with the work.

Mr. GARD. Now, there is one element in this bill that is entirely at variance, as I take it, with what should be the provision. The bill comes from the Committee on Flood Control. It has for its purpose the control of flood waters up in that country. That is a laudable purpose. I would be glad to contribute as much as I can to have that purpose thoroughly accomplished.

I shall be glad to contribute as much as I can to have that purpose thoroughly accomplished, but I note on page 2 of the bill it provides also that they—

may agree upon as necessary for the prevention and control of floods, the improvement of navigation.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is some navigation.

Mr. GARD. Necessarily there must be an association between navigation and flood control under the language of the bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Oh, well, the gentleman will remember that when the Flood Control Committee was created the House took away certain jurisdiction theretofore conferred on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. GARD. Yes; I remember that.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. And we passed a bill in reference to flood control on the Mississippi River, which is directly in the interest of navigation; and it has always been the policy of Congress, wherever there was any possibility of navigation, wherever authority was given for the construction of dams or otherwise, that the War Department should require the interests of navigation to be conserved.

Mr. GARD. The flood-control act which the gentleman speaks about did not carry for its purpose the improvement of navigation.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was one of the purposes.

Mr. GARD. That is always carried in the river and harbor bill.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That was one of the purposes. That was the very reason why the Committee on Rivers and Harbors fought the creation of the Flood Control Committee.

Mr. GARD. It is but an incident of flood control. The primary purpose is the control of flood waters, which is very often entirely inconsistent with navigation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Never.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When they start the prevention and control of floods, they ought also to consider the improvement of navigation, and we always require the War Department to do that.

Mr. GARD. Is this a navigable river?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The dam will be built at the lower end of Lake Traverse, which has some navigation.

Mr. GARD. What sort of navigation is there?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. They have grain elevators on the lake, and some boats haul grain and other commodities to and from the upper end of it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There will be a great deal more navigation if they build a dam there than there will if they do not.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It will undoubtedly increase navigation.

Mr. GARD. The previous bill carried the statement that there was no liability on the part of the United States. Is it intended that there shall be no financial liability upon the United States as a result of the passage of this bill?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. All the expense will be borne by the taxpayers in the immediate vicinity, who own land that will be benefited by the work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the drainage districts and other municipal authorities of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota, or any one or more of them now or hereafter organized and existing under the laws of said States, are hereby authorized to construct a dam at or near the outlet of Lake Traverse in the Boise de Sioux River, together with such dikes, spillways, diversion channels, and other works in said river and lake, and the Red River of the North, as such districts or municipal authorities, or any of them, may agree upon as necessary for the prevention and control of floods, the improvement of navigation, and the drainage of lands, and for that purpose may deepen and straighten any parts of said rivers: *Provided*, That plans for the work hereby authorized shall be submitted to the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers for their approval, and unless and until approved by them, no part of such work shall be built or commenced.

*Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

PATENTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9932) authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable controversy over this measure, and I think it will be just as well off the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. I ask unanimous consent that it be stricken from that calendar.

Mr. GARD. I object to the consideration of the bill. That will take it off.

Mr. NOLAN. That automatically takes it off the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN COUNTIES IN NEW MEXICO FROM GRANT-LAND FUNDS OF THE STATE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3867) authorizing the State of New Mexico to apply the proceeds of the grant to said State of 1,000,000 acres of land made by section 7 of the enabling act, June 20, 1910, for the reimbursement of Grant County, Luna County, Hidalgo County, Santa Fe County, and the town of Silver City, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, this matter has been before considered on the calendar for unanimous consent, and I call the attention of those who may be proponents of the bill on the floor to-day to the statement contained in the letter of Secretary Lane of February 12, 1919, to the effect:

According to my understanding, however, Santa Fe County, notwithstanding the validation of the said bonds by Congress, did not at any time pay either the interest or principal and the bonds and accrued interest remained unpaid at the date of the admission of New Mexico into the Union. On the other hand, Grant County at all times paid the interest on its bonds as it became due and payable. This is likewise true of Luna County, which had been carved out of Grant County in 1901, and had assumed its proportionate share of the indebtedness evidenced by the bonds validated and confirmed by the act of 1897, supra, and at the date of admission of the State into the Union only the principal of the said bonds was outstanding, and there was no debt due by either of said counties at that date on account of accrued interest on these bonds.

So that unless we can have a report from the Secretary of the Interior as to the payment of this money which is now asked to be reimbursed I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. SINNOTT. The gentleman read from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior of February 12, 1919. Here is a letter in the report from the Secretary of the Interior of February 18, 1920, in which he says:

Should it be shown, however, to the satisfaction of your committee that Santa Fe County is entitled to be reimbursed for any moneys paid by it, I have no objection to offer to the enactment of this bill.

The Secretary, when he wrote the other letter, did not have the full information. I have a certified copy of the records of Santa Fe County showing that Santa Fe County paid \$65,427.50.

Mr. GARD. I am glad to have that additional information. Still, the Secretary of the Interior says that "should it be shown to the satisfaction of your committee that Santa Fe County is entitled to be reimbursed, I have no objection to offer to the enactment of the bill." There has no affirmative evidence been shown to the department.

Mr. SINNOTT. I have the evidence here.

Mr. GARD. I say, unfortunately, that the statement the gentleman makes is not so conclusive as to carry with it the

recommendation of the department. In other words, the paper that the gentleman calls a certificate has never been presented to the department for a proper report of the matter.

Mr. SINNOTT. It has been presented to the committee by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ], who is always diligent and watchful for the interests of his State. He is absent on official business with the Indian Committee. Before he left he asked me to look after this bill. I have also personally conferred with Senator Jones of New Mexico, and he says the county paid this interest. I do not think we should be compelled to make a showing to the Secretary of the Interior in order to get back from him another report, inasmuch as he stated in his letter of February 18, 1920, that if it was shown to the satisfaction of the committee, and so forth, and it has been shown to the satisfaction of the committee that this county paid \$65,427.50.

Mr. GARD. But the statement appearing on page 4 of the report is that it has not been shown that it was paid, or whether it has been paid, or enough of it to authorize this refund, the report does not show.

Mr. SINNOTT. The letter which the gentleman read from page 4 was dated February 12, 1919, and the letter I read is dated February 18, 1920.

Mr. GARD. My criticism is that it does not explain away the declaration of February 12, 1919.

Mr. SINNOTT. It shows absolutely that the interest has been paid.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. As a member of the subcommittee, we took full testimony on this, and we had a certified copy of the record showing that this county had paid this money.

Mr. GARD. How much did Santa Fe County pay?

Mr. SINNOTT. Sixty-five thousand four hundred and twenty-seven dollars and fifty cents. Here is a certificate of Alfredo Lucero, the clerk of the district court of the first judicial district of the State of New Mexico, and it is also certified to by the same person as the clerk of the county of Santa Fe.

Mr. GARD. What was the amount of the interest on the principal and the accrued interest on the bonds?

Mr. SINNOTT. I have it here. It reads:

Interest paid by Santa Fe County on railroad bonds per bond register.

On bonds of 1880 and coupons amounts to \$36,470.

The total interest paid by Santa Fe County on the coupons is summarized: Bonds of 1880, \$36,470; bonds of 1887, \$7,920; bonds of 1891-92, \$21,037.50; making a total of \$65,427.50. Here are the certificates:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
County of Santa Fe, ss:

I, Alfredo Lucero, clerk of the county of Santa Fe and State of New Mexico, do hereby certify that the foregoing three pages contain a true, correct, and complete copy of the bond register of said county, showing the payment of coupons on interest-bearing bonds, and their respective numbers as the same were paid by the county treasurer of said county.

In witness hereof I have hereunto set my hand and official seal at my office in the city of Santa Fe, county of Santa Fe, and State of New Mexico, this 4th day of March, 1920.

(Signed) ALFREDO LUCERO,
County Clerk of the County of Santa Fe,
State of New Mexico.

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
County of Santa Fe, ss:

I, Reed Holloman, judge of the first judicial district of the State of New Mexico and judge of the district court within and for the county of Santa Fe, do hereby certify that Alfredo Lucero, by whom the above attestation was made, was, at the time and date thereof, clerk of said court, duly qualified, and that the said attestation is in due form of law and made by the proper officer.

(Signed) REED HOLLOMAN,
Judge First Judicial District,
State of New Mexico, etc.

Mr. WALSH. Well, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen do not seem to make much progress in satisfying the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. I would prefer that the matter had been finally submitted to the department, so the Secretary could explain that which he said had not been done, if it has been done. I confess it is difficult for me to learn from the reading of the certificates whether or not this has been paid. If it has been, I do not care to stand in the way of the enactment of the bill even through this extraordinary process.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It would be up to the State of New Mexico to determine whether the money had been paid or not. Does not the gentleman think it wholly unlikely that the State will pay money out of the treasury to the county of Santa Fe unless perfect proof is offered, which they have on record in the State and county?

Mr. GARD. I do not know, but I should say that Congress should have some proof before acting upon it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. All we do is to confer on the State the authority to pay the money which the State owes and which the county claims it is entitled to.

Mr. GARD. Necessarily we should have some proof to show that the county has actually paid it before we pass enabling legislation. If the gentleman is satisfied from the certificate that they did pay the amount of interest that they were chargeable with at the time and which the State desires to refund, I have no objection.

Mr. SINNOTT. I am absolutely satisfied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority and consent of Congress is hereby granted to the State of New Mexico to apply any part of the proceeds of the grant to said State of 1,000,000 acres of land made by section 7 of the enabling act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 557), for the reimbursement of Grant, Luna, and Hidalgo Counties for interest paid by said counties on the bonds of Grant County, and for the reimbursement of Santa Fe County for interest paid by said county on the bonds of Santa Fe County, which said bonds were validated, approved, and confirmed by act of Congress of January 16, 1897 (29 Stats., p. 487), and also for the payment of the principal of the bonds issued by the town of Silver City and likewise validated by said act of January 16, 1897, and to reimburse the town of Silver City for interest paid by said town on said bonds, all in addition to the obligations provided in said enabling act to be paid from the proceeds of said grant.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ABANDONED PORTIONS OF RAILROADS' RIGHTS OF WAY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9899) to provide for the disposition of abandoned portions of rights of way granted to railroad companies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was considered before, and after an interrogation by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it was objected to by myself. Afterwards I had the privilege of talking with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON] about some amendments. Has the gentleman any amendments to propose to the bill?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes; the amendments that I propose to offer are minor amendments correcting the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. GARD. I have not the bill before me, and under the reservation of an objection I would like to have the gentleman advise me and the Members of the House what the proposed amendments are.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The amendments that I propose to offer are, in line 3, on page 2, to strike out the words "or its heirs"; in line 11, strike out the word "patent" and insert in lieu thereof the word "title"; and in line 15, to strike out the first word "or" and insert in lieu thereof the word "of."

Mr. GARD. The objection which was in my mind was that without any process by anybody, except the proof of the matter of abandonment, the title to this land vested in some subdivision which was outside a municipality, and simply because a man might own a piece of ground contiguous to this abandoned land, by virtue of the ownership and no other action he became entitled to this abandoned land. It seems to me there ought to be some approval by some one who has charge of the land rather than have the automatic addition to the man's own land.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. This does not do that automatically. The bill was originally drawn so that it would automatically do it, but by the suggestion of the department there was a committee amendment which has been submitted by the committee and which I will read—

whether by forfeiture or by abandonment by said railroad company, declared or decreed by a court of competent jurisdiction or by act of Congress.

With that amendment the parties would either have to go into court and get a decree declaring the land forfeited in a competent court or by a special act of Congress. We should also bear in mind that this does not operate upon any railroad lands, excepting those that have been granted by the Government for railroad purposes alone, and the Supreme Court has said they have simply a base title, and when they abandon the lands for

railroad purposes they had no further rights in them. You are not taking anything away from the railroads by passing this act, because they have no other rights in it.

Mr. GARD. I understand they have no further rights in it by abandonment, but that which I desire to direct the attention of the gentleman to is that before these abandoned strips vest in somebody else they should be submitted so some authority rather than to have them vest in a municipality because the strips happen to be there, or vest in a legal subdivision because it is immediately next thereto.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Here is a strip of road 100 or 200 feet wide, running through a quarter section of land. It would not be suggested that the Department of the Interior would grant title to a narrow strip to some one else, but it would naturally go to the party who has the original tract or subdivision, because to grant title to some one else or grant the Interior Department the right to pass upon whether it should go to the adjoining owner or to some one else, would leave it then where they might grant title to a narrow strip running through a quarter to another party.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Did not the acts of June 26, 1906, and February 25, 1909, make the same disposition of title that is proposed in this act?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Just exactly, and the only trouble with those two acts are, as stated by the Interior Department, that they were present in their operation and did not affect rights of way that have been abandoned or changed since the passage of those two acts. Now, this question in my State is that we have a line of road that has straightened its line since the 1909 act, and consequently those two acts do not operate upon these abandoned rights of way.

Mr. MONDELL. Many years ago I introduced a bill on this subject. I think it was probably the act of June 26, 1906. I think it was the first general act of this kind, and I am informed by the gentleman who introduced this bill that the same disposition was made of the title in that bill as in this case. It is the only disposition that can logically and properly be made of the title in such cases.

Mr. GARD. These are public lands originally given as a right of way, and by act of Congress or by decree of court they became abandoned. Whether they are great or small we do not know, but it would seem to me, therefore I am asking the gentleman, that with the abandonment, either by judicial decree or act of Congress, that the land would again revert to the United States and become public land, and there should be some provision made for their revesting in title or patent or whatever it is called in some one other than going to the man or municipality simply because they owned land immediately contiguous to the abandoned strip.

Mr. MONDELL. At the time the first act referred to in the report was passed the public domain in the West was covered with almost an innumerable number of these rights of way. Many men were occupying lands that were covered by one or two rights of way, without any knowledge on their part that there was any right-of-way cloud on their title. These congressional terminations of rights of way are necessary because, while the company having failed to comply with the conditions of the law has no longer any legal right, there is still a question as to the title where a patent was obtained after the land was clouded by a right of way.

Mr. GARD. This is not an abandonment by a congressional action. This provides what may be done in the event of congressional action or in the event of a judicial decree, and has for its purpose the absolute vesting of title to land in the municipality through which the strip runs or in the owner of some legal subdivision—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman intend to object to the bill? If he does not, I intend to object.

Mr. GARD. If the gentleman desires to object, I think possibly he can save time.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I object.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Will the gentleman just withhold that for a moment. I am certain I can make it clear. In my State a quarter section—

Mr. BLANTON. Let me ask a question or two. The title of the railroad company was good only so long as the railroad company maintained operations, and immediately upon the cessation of operations reversion took place to the Government.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, what is the gentleman seeking to do with this land which reverts back to the Government?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. I want to give it to the man who owns a legal subdivision.

Mr. BLANTON. Why is a man who owns a legal subdivision entitled to something that he never purchased?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Because he would have received it in the first instance if the right of way had not been there.

Mr. BLANTON. And would have paid for it the same price as he paid for his other land?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Now, let me tell the gentleman this is the case I have in mind—

Mr. BLANTON. Just one point right there. The man is entitled to so many acres as a homestead?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. If he does not get all of his acreage in one tract he can get the balance to which he is entitled out of another vacant tract, can he not?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No. Here is a legal subdivision of 160 acres, and the railroad has gone through and taken out 100 feet of it running through—

Mr. BLANTON. Which amounts to 10 or 12 acres?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Not as much as that; only a few acres.

Mr. BLANTON. A few acres. If the man was entitled to 160 acres, was he not entitled to take up a part of his homestead—

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. No; he could only take a quarter of a section. Here is the point—

Mr. BLANTON. Why, does not the gentleman know the Land Office has granted patents in some cases to some three or four or five different tracts of land, each embracing the homestead of an individual?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That may be true, but not in this case. Here is a narrow strip, and the Government would not get anything for it, or sell it to anybody, and you are reducing the value of that quarter section of land by returning title in the Government to a narrow strip.

Mr. BLANTON. Suppose it has under it oil or coal or gas, or something else of value?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. The land I have in mind is on the Milwaukee extension running to the coast. Later this company straightened the line and abandoned certain parts of the old line.

Mr. BLANTON. But your bill is a general bill, applicable to all public lands in the various States of the United States.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. It does not contain a single right except what is contained in two acts, one passed in 1906 and one in 1909, by Congress relating to this same subject.

Mr. BLANTON. And while there may not be oil, or gas, or coal, under the gentleman's particular land in which he is interested, the gentleman may know that down in Oklahoma, Louisiana, and other places sometimes 1 acre of land might be worth ten millions of dollars, with oil wells producing on it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Wait a minute. If I am not mistaken—I can not say positively—I think in all of the lands granted here there have been reserved the minerals. I believe they have in the lands granted to the State of South Dakota. I have no objection to an amendment if the gentleman desires that they shall be reserved.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think this kind of a bill should be taken up and passed on Decoration Day at three minutes past 6 o'clock, with only a few of us here who have been here since 12 o'clock.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. This is a bill that ought to be passed.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman from Texas yield a minute?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GANDY. In the case of a homestead upon which there is a railroad right of way, the homesteader pays just exactly the same fee to the land office, whether there is or is not a railroad right of way.

Mr. BLANTON. Take it down in Louisiana or Oklahoma—

Mr. GANDY. Let me finish the statement. In the land involved, or in any other place in South Dakota, where the right of way might be abandoned, the homesteader in compliance with the law has already performed the requisite and necessary improvement and necessary cultivation to the necessary acreage of land to which he was entitled. He was entitled to it then and is entitled to it now.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to something he may have overlooked. Down on the Red River now the Government of the United States has a controversy where just one-half of the river bed alone is worth millions of dollars. And there are certain parts of the country, which I could cite the gentleman to, where the right of way of rail-

roads is worth millions of dollars by reason of oil and coal and gas found underneath the ground.

Mr. GANDY. Let me say to the gentleman there would be no objection—

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the gentleman from Wyoming to adjourn?

Mr. MONDELL. I have been informed by one or two gentlemen that they propose making a point of no quorum about this time. While I should be very glad to go on, I realize we can not do so without a quorum.

Mr. GARD. I make the point of order—

Mr. MONDELL. I know that some Members would not wish to come in this evening in answer to a roll call, and therefore I think we better adjourn before a point of no quorum is made. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MEMORIAL DAY.

Mr. MONDELL. This is the day, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARD. I have pending a point of order that there is no quorum present, but I reserve it. I withdraw the point.

Mr. MONDELL. I propose making a motion to adjourn very soon.

Mr. Speaker, this is the day set aside by custom and law in memory and honor of the Nation's heroic dead. Throughout the length and breadth of the land patriotic citizens are strewing flowers on the graves and doing honor to the memory of those who have worn the Nation's uniform and upheld and defended the Nation's flag. In order to dispose of the public business, it has been necessary for the Congress to remain in session to-day. But during this time, while we have been giving attention to the people's business, our hearts have been with the patriotic citizens throughout the country who are honoring the memory and decorating the graves of the Nation's defenders. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn in honor of Memorial Day and in honor of the heroic men and women in whose memory the day was established and is celebrated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] withhold that just a moment?

Mr. GARD. I do not desire to make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. I will move to adjourn in just a moment. I want to say to the gentlemen present that from this time on it will be necessary to remain in session rather late in the evening, if we are to conclude the business and get away from here this week. I think gentlemen should so arrange their affairs as to be able to be here until quite a late hour to-morrow night and the following nights of the week until Saturday. After to-morrow I shall ask unanimous consent that when we meet we meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think it would be better practice to take a recess from 6 o'clock in the evening until 8, so that Members can go and get something to eat?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that would be best. If we can secure an agreement to that effect, I will be very glad to make that arrangement.

Mr. DYER. Do it now.

Mr. BLANTON. We could hold continuously on if the gentleman from Wyoming would furnish us with a little grape juice and sandwiches and things of that kind.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 400. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 3184. An act to create a Federal power commission, to provide for the improvement of navigation, the development of water power, the use of the public lands in relation thereto, and to repeal section 18 of the river and harbor appropriation act approved August 8, 1917, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12272. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921; and

H. R. 12775. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense,

and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 1, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. DENISON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4167) to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions and additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1068), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1069), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RODENBERG, from the Committee on Flood Control, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14311) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1070), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14286) to authorize officers of the naval service to accept offices with compensation and emoluments from governments of the Republic of South America, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1071), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HICKS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14123) to create a Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of the Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1073), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 14335) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 14336) to amend an act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 14337) authorizing the disposition of certain lands title to which was acquired by the United States for naval purposes during the war, which lands are no longer needed for naval purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOON (by direction of the Joint Commission on Postal Salaries): A bill (H. R. 14338) to reclassify postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the compensation of United States postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 14339) granting an increase of pension to Roxie L. Colbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 14340) granting an increase of pension to William Homer Edwards; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14341) granting an increase of pension to Mervin A. Coshun; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNALLY: A bill (H. R. 14342) for the relief of Mrs. John P. Hopkins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 14343) granting a pension to Indiana Abbott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14344) granting a pension to Jacob Sigler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14345) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bernhart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 14346) granting a pension to Alice M. Burke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 14347) granting a pension to William Sally; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 14348) for the relief of H. L. Myers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 14349) granting a pension to Annie Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 14350) for the relief of Perley Morse & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14351) for the relief of A. W. Duckett & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 14352) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hurrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 14353) granting a pension to Janie Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4025. By Mr. CAREW: Petition of trades council, Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, Pa., asking repeal of excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4026. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Our Lady of Loretto Council, Knights of Columbus, New York, favoring increases in salaries to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4027. By Mr. DYER: Petition of Bottlers' Local Union No. 187, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4028. Also, petition of Lawton Byrne-Bruner Co., of St. Louis, Mo., and the Gustin Bacon Co., of Kansas City, Mo., favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4029. Also, petition of Comfort Printing & Stationery Co., of St. Louis, and the Tobacco Merchants' Association of the United States, in connection with revision of tax legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4030. Also, petition of St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, protesting against enactment of bonus legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4031. Also, petition of W. Christ Bryan, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring longevity-pay legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4032. By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4033. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of National Convention of Tobacco Merchants, opposing any further tax on business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4034. Also, petition of Illinois Valley Manufacturers' Club, opposing the pending soldiers' bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4035. Also, petition of the Friends of our Native Landscape, opposing House bill 12466, to authorize certain irrigation privileges in Yellowstone National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4036. Also, petition of W. M. Rutler, Illinois State chairman, committee for aid to disabled veterans, urging postponement of bonus legislation until a more adequate provision is made for those who were disabled in the service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4037. Also, petition of J. B. Murray and D. W. Gould, urging action on bill to increase salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4038. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of 136 residents of Dorchester and Brookline, Mass., favoring passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4039. Also, petition of M. J. Coe, of West Newton, Mass., and the eastern New England conference board International Molders' Union of North America, favoring Mason resolution for recognition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4040. Also, petition of John E. Donovan, J. L. Powers, Mike Reagan, and 34 other residents of Boston and South Boston, Mass., favoring increased salaries for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4041. By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Aspario E. Beech and 12 other ex-service men, favoring a cash bonus of \$500; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4042. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Interstate Cotton Seed Crushers' Association of Texas, opposing entrance of the Government into commercial fields; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4043. Also, petition of New York County organization of the American Legion, favoring the Darrow bill; to the Committee on Education.

4044. Also, petition of F. K. Collins, opposing the Fordney bonus bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4045. Also, petition of the A. N. Palmer Co., of New York, favoring increased postal salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4046. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of certain residents of Mandan and Dickinson, N. Dak., favoring the passage of H. R. 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4047. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of 30 citizens of Boston, Mass., appealing for increased compensation for employees of the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4048. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of mayor and city councilmen of Cumberland, Md., asking for additional post-office facilities and the erection of a post-office building at Cumberland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 1, 1920.

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1920.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

ENFORCEMENT OF PROHIBITION.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, my attention has been called to an article which appeared in yesterday's New York World. I bring it to the attention of the Senate, and more particularly to the members of the Committee on Appropriations who are present, that they may know the conditions prevailing in the city of New York, and I am told that they are prevailing generally throughout the large centers of population. This article indicates that dishonest men are trading in forged certificates to permit the taking from bond of whisky, and have cleaned up more than \$10,000,000 in the last two months.

We have in New York City, as in the other large cities in the country, an official the title of whose office is director of prohibition. Applications are made to this official to withdraw liquor from bond or from a distillery. Applications are forwarded to the department here at Washington, and they are invariably approved. They are then returned to the place of application. Usually the permit is granted, although it is the practice in New York to hold up the permits for a considerable period for one reason or another, and some applicants insist that they are required to pay an illegal fee.

The article to which I have referred states that 11,000 permits have been issued in two months in New York City for the withdrawal of whisky from bonded warehouses or from distilleries, and of that number over 1,200 were forged. The article also indicates that the matter was called to the attention of the director, Mr. O'Connor, in New York, and that he was quite surprised, although it has been a matter of common knowledge for the past two months that forged permits were being issued. There has even been an intimation in some quarters that these fake permits were issued with the knowledge of people from the inside.

I have never in all my experience in the city of New York had my attention called to anything that was so indicative of corruption on the part of public officials. I wish to suggest to the members of the Appropriations Committee now present that when requests come to them again for the granting of appropriations for the enforcement of the prohibition law in the larger cities of the country, they ought to scrutinize them with very great care.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—